

BOSTON REVIEW.

VOL. IV.—MAY, 1864.—No. 21.

ARTICLE I.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF EDUCATED MEN TO CHRISTIANITY.

THREE cabalistic letters from the Greek long signified, but only to the initiated, a motto designed to characterize a learned society of the most distinguished undergraduates and alumni of our leading colleges. The veil of secrecy is now removed; the interpretation of the mystic symbol is given to the world; and the society of the Phi Beta Kappa openly affirms that "Philosophy is the guide of life."

This remarkable profession may have been innocently made at the outset, and its involved mistake propagated, traditionally, like other fallacies which are ultimately traceable only to "the spirit of the power of the air." But that it is a fallacy, however unintentionally admitted, or superstitiously handed down, or now reverently maintained, no considerate Christian will question, though he may be forward to excuse it. Nor will its injurious tendency be denied by any who appreciate the subtle influence of a characteristic sign, and the mental associations which it awakens, when made the representative of a false idea.

We make this reference not invidiously, but because, having been ourselves at fault, in this respect, we would now stand

corrected before the world. We would do no dishonor to a venerable society. We could not if we would, and we would not if we could, put it at any disadvantage wherein this single criticism does not apply. But we are bound, as Christian journalists, to maintain that not philosophy, but Christianity, is the guide of life, and to do it now the rather, more discriminately and earnestly, because philosophy, throughout the world, is ambitiously exercising the injurious prerogative which our Christian institutions have incautiously conceded, and which it is becoming so difficult to countervail.

If the human reason be a pure, universal essence, divine, or an outgoing of divinity, and every individual reason, or the reason of a few great men, be the *ultima ratio*, the higher law, from which no appeal can be taken even to a miraculous revelation, we would accept, not the least, its last pantheistic development, and go on, under the guidance of its new lights, to assist its boasted consummation of the perfectibility of man, and its already heralded introduction of a golden age. But that is just the presumption which we deny. We stand by the Logos, the Word made flesh, divinely proclaimed, supernaturally attested, and authoritatively signified by the descent of the Mystic Dove. Christianity is from God, and is absolute. Philosophy is a product of the human reason, and is conditioned. God himself accordingly distinguishes between them. The one is "the wisdom of God and the power of God unto salvation"; the other is "vain imaginations," "craftiness" and "foolishness."

Yet reason has its province. That we discuss not now. It is not material to our purpose. But the reason, whatever be its province, no consistent Christian will deny to be the property of a finite, fallen and sinful being. From whatever causes, it is limited, infirm, irregular, perverse, the servant of depraved affections, and therefore not a proper interpreter of the will of heaven. The subjects which most concern us lie wholly beyond its reach. Nothing that it reaches can be fully comprehended. Within its natural sphere it betrays, through the idol-loves that continually seduce us. A great master has well described them as they figured in his day. But taller idols of the speculative reason, reproduced from that remarkable philosophic period when Paul denounced them in the Areopagus, have largely cap-

tivated society, and multiplied its confusions, since the time of Bacon. In the hand of illuminated philosophers and politicians, the very certainties of abstract science are now made to bewilder and delude us. The wanton imagination sways the calculus itself, in its applications to questions of life and death; and society, consequently, in its heedless traverses, is swallowed in the whirlpools, or shattered on the rocks.

One could, with less scruple, accept philosophy as the guide of life, if its various types could be reduced to a common measure, or a common denominator. But all the spheres might as easily be brought to one diameter, or all the types of men to the same figure and complexion. No master of speculation would now meet, in any learned or popular assembly, an undivided or unqualified response. It would be questioned whether he were not unduly exalting a favorite study, a distinguished school, an ambitious theorist; or whether he sought not to justify his partisan or sectional peculiarities, or disparage the different or opposite peculiarities of other men. And the most eminent would lack the proper sanctions of authority. One coolly affirms, "I am God"; another, "I am the organ and interpreter of God"; and a third, "that it belongs but to two or three in any age or country to be the representatives of true wisdom to the generality." But yet no cloven tongues as of fire appear to them; the dead come not out of the graves at their call. Jordan is not divided; and the New Jerusalem comes not down from heaven.

Wherefore, we profess not philosophy, but Christianity, as the guide of life; we ask the attention of our readers to the peculiar responsibility which it puts upon educated men.

We assume that Christianity is a divine revelation, special and supernatural. For, if its stated evidences do not so prove it, nothing could be proved, and we are afloat on a wild sea of hypothesis and conjecture, where all the hopes of man must necessarily perish. But, if it be a divine revelation, then it is an ultimate criterion of knowledge, wisdom and virtue; for there can be nothing before, or behind, or above God. The abstract ideas of right and wrong which some affect to put before God, and to which they make God subordinate, we owe to the mental and moral constitution which he has given us. Oth-

erwise they are nothing. Our concrete ideas, as of virtue and vice, guilt and innocence, pertain only to the relations which he has constituted and appointed for our moral trial. Christianity refers us to this divine constitution of a moral nature which makes us susceptible of a character, and to the relations in which character is acquired. It claims to be set, accordingly, as the infallible critic of all beings and all subjects within its range. Some things, indeed, it discusses not. It leaves them for the better probation of the natural faculties under their appropriate natural laws.

But it is related to the whole system of things which are open to human inquiry, to the cause in which they subsist, the means by which they consist, and the ends for which they exist. "Of him, and through him, and to him are all things." It is, accordingly so and so far a discernor and judge of all things, that no art, science, government, policy, or other variety of learning which leaves it out of reckoning, or refuses to be tested by it wherein its test naturally applies, can be true, or safe for the ordering of affairs. It is an authoritative regulator of our thoughts and judgments, if not necessarily in reference to the qualities, modes and laws of the phenomena about us, or within us, yet of their common dependence on the infinite mind, the care of a divine providence over them, and their common relation to moral government. The probation under which it places us, in respect to them all, corresponds, of course, to our respective abilities and culture. How mankind in general, or any part of them, behave in this probation, is a mere question of fact. Christianity itself asserts our common failure. History is no less decisive. They who have attained to knowledge, wisdom, or virtue, in any considerable degree, agreeably to this authoritative standard, have constituted but a small fraction of mankind. It is probable that the greater part of its professed teachers have been its worst corrupters, and applied it to the most unworthy ends. Hence the judicial overthrow of its older historic nations. Hence also the Protestant revolutions. They produced reform. Yet Protestantism attained not to primitive simplicity. Wiclif fell short of Peter, and Luther fell short of Paul. Protestantism, in its best periods, has no more warranty against corruption and de-

cline than had Judaism, or primitive Christianity. It is as likely to refer us for doctrine, not to the oracle, but the traditions of the elders, and to beguile us in proportion to the greater intellectual activity it has awakened. No adversary of God is said to have so wide or malignant control over men as the Antichrist of the New Testament embodied in historic systems of unbelief. And the state of things, under all the dispensations, simply corresponds, in this respect, to the facts under God's natural government; for the ordinary gifts of providence have been, for the most part, stimulants to our vagrant fancies, or unruly passions. Pride and luxury have been, to a great extent, but as a synonym of riches, tyranny of power, licentiousness of liberty, and destructiveness of reform. Out of the successive revolutions men have risen to higher levels, to more refined and dignified civilizations, but often to be cast down into barbarian rudeness, a paralytic decrepitude.

Wherefore the strongest reason exists, during the whole of the present probationary state of the earth and man, and now more than ever, for enforcing the responsibility which Christianity imposes upon educated men. It were idle to imagine that we have outlived our dangers. It is certainly possible that while we imagine ourselves nearest to perfection, we should be nearest to our casting down, as it has been in all ages and countries from the beginning.

First: We remark this responsibility under Christianity as a vital religion. And we mean by Christianity the whole of it, historic and prophetic, from the promise of "the seed of the woman" to the final kingdom and coming of our Lord. We mean it in its absoluteness, in distinction from all schools, sects, parties, modes, formularies, creeds, that bear its name and affect to be its representatives, though not necessarily in opposition to them. The Bible has been well called the only book of realities. We assert the real, as written there, in distinction from the apparent, the form or account of it, as given in man's judgments or opinions. We acknowledge an organic, visible church; for the living truth takes to itself a body. But we distinguish between the organism that is mechanical, and the moving principle that is vital, the Christ in ordinances, theories and systems, and Christ within us, the hope of glory. We re-

fuse not interpretations for what they are worth. But they are only as pictures, photographs, and not living men.

We despise no variety of what is called sacred learning. Let it do its best, and as scientifically as it may, and have the largest range and the freest disputation. Let diamond cut diamond. But the truly educated man wants a common solvent, which Christianity itself proposes, the inscrutable influence of the Holy Ghost, proceeding forth, through it, from the Father and the Son, to produce its own spirit, and prepare God's elect people for a promised resurrection state of glory, agreeably to its own letter, as the letter is, and as it stands in the analogy of faith, and not as it is made to speak in the dogmas, formularies or critiques of its perhaps partisan, but certainly finite and fallible expounders. The Bible is unique, peculiar, declarative, positive, final. It is above all our categories and methods, and independent of them. It is not *a priori* and speculative. It is not *a posteriori* and inductive. It is not instructive, sentimental, rational, ideal, intuitional, eclectic. It is above them all, superhuman, supernatural, and not to be measured by our spiritualistic ideas however refined, or squared to our humanitarian standards however dignified. It is supremely and ultimately for our faith alone; for its reach is infinite, connecting the present with what is out of sight preceding, and equally with what is out of sight to come, the known with the unknown, showing what we were, and are, and shall be, and where we are, and as we are, our true position, our latitude and longitude in the vast system of which we are consciously a part. It is a religion of its own — *religare* — to bind us to our Maker, and train and discipline us for an eternal state. It produces, by its promised Spirit, a new and divine life in the sin-destroyed soul, and it ministers sustenance and strength to the heavenly principle. The life is a simple principle and indefinable. The growth is related to all the susceptibilities and activities of our complex being. The life is the same in all who have received the quickening Spirit, the child and the old man, the rich and the poor, the savage and the sage. It is independent of race, nationality, and condition: "There is neither Greek, nor Jew; barbarian, Scythian, bond or free." It recognizes all these statedly constituted relations. It confounds them not, but confirms them,

except as by grace, it may qualify any man for a higher than his natural sphere. But it is developed, when its spirit is supernaturally produced, through all the faculties of the living agent, and they are likely, when there is no countervailing law, to become its scale and measure.

The renewed mind, of quick instincts, has a greater capacity of Christian excellence than the sluggish and inapprehensive mind. The reasoning mind takes in a larger range of elevating thought than the instinctive or sensational; and the highly imaginative, while it keeps within the limits of the speculative faculty, enlarges the sphere of liberal studies, of heavenly meditation and devout affection. Then all other knowledges wheel into their proper circles, and roll in their appointed orbits around the central sun. Inasmuch as any man is gifted to comprehend them, in their stated relations, he acquires a better method of learning and a higher likeness to the divine intelligence. The life stimulates the culture; the culture invigorates the life. The reciprocal effect is the indefinite advancement of the soul in whatever sphere of study or of action God appoints its particular probation. All the way up from Onesimus to Paul is the chain of sanctified intellect and affection. But according to the sphere and measure of every man is his proper responsibility, and the judicial issues will correspond.

But nothing answers practically to its theory, and Christianity is not an exception. It has its own law, its manner of activity. But it is hindered by other laws, by the idolatries of the sense and of the reason; by the jealousies and the strifes of parties; by the adverse peculiarities of individual men; by the types of an ever changing civilization; and we know not what invisible influences from another sphere. Perturbations and eccentricities exist as well in moral natures as in the depths of the earth, or the circles of the heavens. Practically Christianity is hindered. It is most hindered where otherwise it would produce its best effects, and dishonored where it should be most dignified, among learned men. It has been most obscured where it should have had its highest illustration, in the schools. Scholasticism has been the fruitful mother of all the idolatries old or new. It has done to Christianity what it had

done to natural religion, changed its glory to corruptible images, a gross sensualism, on the one hand, figured in blocks and stones, and made active in bigotries and superstitions that have broken the spirit of humanity; or, oppositely, to a spiritual imagery and a corresponding fanaticism more subtle, intoxicating and destructive than even a Greek imagination had conceived, by the lights which it has reflected, through deceitful media, from Christianity itself, upon the forbidden precincts of the spiritual world. Out of such false wisdom has proceeded almost every current that has swept along the unconscious masses to their ruin. Romanism, that broods over human ignorance, and hatches its cockatrice-eggs, springs not out of ignorance. Rationalism, that influences the wild thousands of revolutionary history, is not brought forth where it finally subsides, in hovels. Aristotle and Plato live over again in every period of a better dispensation. They sway us, insensibly, hither and thither, to this side or that side of the central truth, the *via media* of the only infallible philosophy, the wisdom from above. They affect new artifices as the world grows old in sin. They combine the stately dignity of the academy, the ceremonial sanctity of the cathedral, the formal and cold gentility of courtly halls, and the jaunty freedom of the popular assembly; and they are heralded and shouted as heaven-descended by the multitude of undiscerning but sympathising minds that perceive not the fallacy till it destroys them.

Christianity has a saving power; but not to abridge our moral freedom, or frustrate its own appointments of a probationary state. Its efficacy is conditioned not only on its presence, in its proper character, to the mind, but its presence in the mind, inwrought and inworking by its promised Spirit. Nothing can act where it is not, except ceremonially or fantastically, leaving the springs of moral action untouched. Christianity has its own perfect law. But there is a law of evil as well as of good, and these are in habitual conflict. We must look at moral government on both sides of it. Against the Christian confessors we must put the sophists and infidels of every grade. Otherwise, we are one-sided, partial and practically false. Christianity is not a *Materia Medica* — a mere remedial system, by chemical process combining or assimilating

all natures, mechanically, without respect to our voluntary activity, or the sovereign purposes of God. It is put, not logically to our judgment, but declaratively to our faith; not physically to constrain us, but morally for our choice. Between the choosing and refusing it discriminates. In the refusal is guilt. In the opportunity to refuse or accept is moral trial. In the issue moral government will be honored. It could have saved the Jews; but they refused it. It could save the so-called Christian nations; but they pervert it. Christianity puts us at the greatest possible advantage in regard to personal character and influence. It could flow out from us, as waters over the wastes and deserts of the earth, to produce universal fruitfulness and gladness. But its history, in this respect, answers not to its design, for practically we fail in our probation, and its reproach lies consequently upon us inasmuch as our right use of it might long ago have renovated the earth.

It is material to observe how we fail in point of a vitalizing faith. We accept not the record as it is, but as we would have it. We compel it to speak in our words, to be a mere echo of our ideas, and to work in our gearing. We make it our servant, and not our master. We reverse God's constituted order of sacred learning. We put doctrine before miracle; induction before doctrine; speculation before induction; intuition before speculation; and, before them all, as the final arbiter, the *vox populi* and the ballot-box, and some partisan French or German official as *custos rotulorum*. We become critics, commentators, historians, essayists, editors, and then politicians, or we accept their version or account of Christian doctrine, and so bringing church and state together in virtual if not formal alliance, think to regenerate the world. We test not the masters by the law and the testimony. We imagine, with some illuminated hierophant, when, with the better minded John, we should see with our eyes and handle with our hands. We sentimentalize and dream when we should experience. We look for resemblances when we should look for differences and distinctions. We mistake our hopes or wishes for realities. We confound the actual and possible uses of Christianity, and apply it practically, not as a life, but as a lever; not as a productive, but motive power; and, politically, for supposed utility and happiness, not, spirit-

ually, for the conversion of the soul. We figure it to ourselves, romantically, as an all-comprehending element, a universal solvent, a magnetic principle attracting to itself all learning, wit, and beauty; a centre to which art, and arms and governments are all tending by a sort of spiritual gravitation, like the fiction of a universal reason gradually absorbing back into itself all that had been developed from it. This covert pantheism obscures the simplicities of Scripture. It blinds us to its actual verities, and the hardly less affecting lessons of experience, analogy and history. We forget that in the present constitution and course of nature, the possible and the actual are heaven-wide apart, and that Christianity runs out practically to an issue of antagonistic forces, in which not our speculative ideas of what is best, but the perfection of moral government will have a manifestation before the world. We observe not that the blazonry upon its shield is not now "*gaudet victoria*," but "*gaudet tentamine virtus*"; that victory cometh not from, or to, or by, the natural, but the supernatural, and is crowned and jubilant only when the battle of life is over. Meanwhile we reveal our hearts, and our accounts are made up for heaven or hell. The whole scheme puts us on our good behavior in reference to those opposite results of good and evil, in which the divine and not human wisdom will be glorified.

So our philosophy, falsely so called, misleads us, mistaking fictions for facts; semblances for realities; the formal for the vital; the intellectual for the moral; the æsthetical and sentimental for the spiritual; the eclecticism of the finite for the absolute of the infinite. We do not wrong in going to school; for that is our necessity in this world; but in not testing the masters by an authority which is above them all, and not disallowing their pretended profitableness wherein they have not profited by drawing at the fountain head. We make small account of the Pascals, the Butlers, the Owens, the Edwardses, and wander in the mists with Kant, and Coleridge, and Hegel, and Cousin. We substitute some specious cosmopolite for the trusty Greatheart, mistake enchanted ground for paradise, and Vanity Fair for the New Jerusalem. Jordan is a hard road to travel, and we locate the celestial city on the hither side of it.

We do not overrate this responsibility of educated men.

Abilities, discipline, learning have a rightful power, and the Christian life of educated men would give to Christianity a freer access to other minds, and a wider scope. It could do without them. It has sometimes performed its greatest wonders by inconsiderable means, or without means, by fishermen, by babes, by fools, by things which are not. But this has been to exalt its own prerogative; not to disparage learning, but confound and abase it, when it has not been true to its *principia*, and has given the human precedence of the divine. It has both used and refused, both honored and dishonored it, and so has proved it to be under moral government and responsible. To what extent, in the proper conditions, it would be likely to advance society, is past all reckoning. That vision yet tarries to the world which still lieth in its wickedness. Whether it will descend at all till the dawn of the day of promise, is a question that will doubtless yet more confuse and fret the world and puzzle its philosophers, theologians and politicians who interpret the oracle by reason and not by faith. Would any truly resolve such questions? They must renounce the earthly for the heavenly wisdom, for that only is the heavenly order: "I thank thee, oh Father! Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes."

Secondly: We remark the responsibility of educated men in reference to the incidental and collateral uses of Christianity.

Things secular and political make no part of Christianity. They are never touched by it except in reference to the invisible kingdom of God in renewed men, which ever goeth on to its glorious manifestation in the issue of a probationary state. Christianity moves on a higher plane. It simply advises us how to behave ourselves in the complications of the present mixed scene of things, with reference to the ends of moral government. Families, states, nations, races, have their respective courses according to a natural order, and are affected by Christianity only as it gives them direction and tone through the individuals, particularly the leaders of society, who form a part of them. But this indirect action of Christianity modifies our political and social states. It is not easy to overrate it. Bad men admit its conservative utility. The world-governments

would not presume openly to refuse it. Partisans propitiate its sects and its ministers, though to its greater ultimate prostitution and dishonor, yet, meanwhile, to their own greater temporary respectability and power. For Christianity holds the conscience of men, the sensibilities, the imagination and passions. It regulates when it does not convert. It moderates power, tempers legislation, restrains liberty. It chastens literature, purifies the intercourse of social life, makes all industrial pursuits subservient to a greater utility and convenience, and multiplies facilities for a more diffused intelligence and thrifful activity. A merely nominal Christianity is at least an adornment to civilization. Its æsthetic value is of itself no inconsiderable figure. Society would be, for a while, in a better state, though its religion were reduced to mere form and pageantry, than if it were but speculative and ideal, refined into spiritualistic fantasies that should put it out of all connection with the common affairs of life. A mediæval Christ is better than a cosmopolitan Christ. Or, if these should be combined in a product half stupid and half delirious, that mixed superstitious and fanatical Christ would be better, possibly, in respect to ultimate recovery, than no Christ. For the magnetic action of the brain would keep the lower extremities in motion; and a monstrous activity, at a venture, is less discouraging than a state of death. Such a spurious religion would yet act as a stimulus to the declining moral energies of society, like as the divine providence introduces mechanical invention to assist man's decaying strength; or enlarges the *Materia Medica* to relieve his increasing alimentary obstructions; or multiplies gems and cosmetics to repair his fading beauty; or theories, conceits and visions to make up for the lack of intellectual-vigor, proving yet a remaining degree of conservative activity to defer or shorten his necessary catastrophies. Or, a greater apparent degradation of Christianity might happen without essential dishonor. A Christianized and cultivated people might become the worst of all people through the very spring which Christianity innocently gives to the physical activities of men, like as a noxious equally with a wholesome vegetation owes its luxuriance to the same sunshine and rain of heaven. The sun is glorious. Who would extinguish the sun? Yet, if any man would live under the equator, he

must make up his reckoning with malaria, and storms, and earthquakes, with poisonous products, noxious animals, and degraded humanity. The sun is not at fault; but the earth and man, the one depraved in his affections; the other having its constitution broken, and jostled in its polarity. The ecliptic cuts the equator.

The direction of this collateral as well as of the vital influence of Christianity, is mainly in the hands of educated men. They are at the centre of the social system. Whether that providential order is best, men may speculate as they will. They may affect to modify, or reverse it; to equalize all conditions, or subordinate the higher to the lower. But they can not permanently alter it. In their vain attempts to do this they dash against a wall. No theory can practically annul the law of gravity; nor could any corresponding violence that would not destroy the balance of the social system. The divine constitution will have its course till its ends are answered in the appointed issues of moral government. After all the insane plunges of society, we are obliged to fall back on principled intelligence and wisdom for the ruling of the world, or restoring it from its confusions. Children may demolish. Men only can construct. Luxury may corrupt society. Party spirit may heave it. Passion may disorganize it. Force may subject it. But wisdom only can guide it. "There was found in the city a poor wise man, and he, by his wisdom, delivered the city, yet no man remembered that same poor man." For the subversion of that fundamental law there is no principle, precept, or precedent in Christianity. It belongs only to the encyclopædia. Admit any of the socialistic theories, or spiritualistic revelations to be better, they are so only as ingenious fictions, pictures hung up in the chambers of imagery, or cells of the recluse, which are never ventilated, articles of virtue for the curious, or pleasant day-dreams for the sentimental, or bright visions of a golden age for the romantic, or cunning devices of the politician, or baptised fancies of the mystified theologian. They pertain not to the earth, as things are and ever must be upon it. They pertain not to heaven; for there "are thrones, and dominions, and principalities and powers; and one star differeth from another star in glory." Scanty enough our knowledge is, at

best, and weak our virtue. They may fail to save the world. Anglo-Saxon wisdom and virtue may fail, as did the old wisdom out of which they grew. With a corrupted Christianity what better were old England, or New England, or a universal Teutonic compound, than the mind of the glorious East where wisdom was born, and the true Wisdom became incarnate, but was driven out? The human, in its best conditions, soon reaches its limits in the present state. Its successive rises surprise us. Its successive declines confound us. Its perversions and abuses produce the worst reactions of society. But if selfish intelligence and wisdom fail, what must not become of selfish ignorance and folly? Should the abuses of constituted power react to cast down the divine ordinance of rule and government; and the pride of self-aggrandizing learning produce a reflux tide of more licentious ignorance; and usurping and overreaching greatness be humbled before besotted littleness, the last chapter of this world's history would be written.

Great questions here open to us, of the greatest concernment to educated men, the relations of the church and state. They have never been settled. Christianity only can resolve them. Philosophically, the problem is three-fold: the absorption of the church in the state, the magistracy having the general control; the absorption of the state in the church under prelate rule; and the interpenetration of both with a mixed secular and sacred sovereignty. It has exercised the human faculties hitherto to no purpose. It has provoked destructive wars of sections and parties, but the demonstration has not been reached. Hence another problem, the greatest of all: whether church and state will ever, during the present dispensation of Christianity, be conciliated, harmonized and attempered, so as to give the world what it must have if it would be saved, a spiritual theocracy: for Christianity never loses sight of the consummation for which, till the winding up of its present economy, it teaches us continually to pray: "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven." But let us observe how this is.

Government is over all. It presupposes a fountain-head of all authority. It implies law, subjects and rule. All these facts of government are signified when we use that single term, the state. Government and state are mainly equivalent; but

state has a peculiar significance, because it implies settlement in a determinate course, interiorly, of moral life, and, exteriorly, of organization and process. The state is as the moral being indefinitely multiplied and extended. It is ordained of God. It is propagated and sustained by general laws, and accountable accordingly. It is coeval with the race, and necessary to the existence of the race. We cannot conceive of the race without it. It is the manner in which the race exists under its providential partitions and divisions during its appointed ages of probation. We can not concrete the idea of humanity but by the state. We can conceive of the race with diverse forms of government, but not without some form of government under God. Such is the wide theocracy of the earth, the aggregate of the nations. And every distinct class of the multiples of man, every separately organized civil community, under its own proper constitution, is a state. Every particular state, or union of states, is a moral institution. Its reasons are self-evident. They are not the less self-evident because some sophists deny them, just as the external world, or our own personality, or the divine personality, are not the less self-evident because some have reasoned away their personal consciousness or their sense-perceptions, and have resolved all things into an idea.

But the church is not a moral institution, that is, it exists not necessarily. Its reasons are not self-evident. It is not an institution of which we could not conceive that it should not be, or should not be otherwise than as it is. We could not conceive, *a priori*, however the contrary has been pretended, that it would be at all. It exists for reasons which could not have been known without a revelation, and revelation is given, not for our convenience, but our necessities. It was not founded for reasons pertaining ultimately to the church itself, or to the state, such as life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, or any other reasons such as the theorists imagine, but to worlds and ends wholly beyond our comprehension. The state is relative to man as a natural agent however under moral government, in a course of present life. The church is relative to man as redeemed and justified, under a dispensation of grace, in reference to a life to come. The state is political; its powers

are secular. The church is spiritual; its powers are of the world to come. The state is universal. The church is particular. The state is absolute; we are necessarily born into it. The church is contingent; we are born again into it by special grace, at the mere pleasure of God. The state is the comprehensive circle. The church is a wheel within a wheel, an *imperium in imperio*, organized only in respect to its peculiar distinctive character. The state dies upon the general dissolution of the present system of things. The church lives on forever. But both church and state revolve about their common centre, in reference to a common end, not the happiness of both or either, but the manifestation of the divine perfections to other worlds and systems in the issues of a probationary state.

Such being the difference between the church and the state, of which their distinct organizations are a proof, it results that they can have no authority, the one over the other, in any matter affecting their distinct and peculiar interests. They cannot legislate the one for the other, or otherwise interfere, during the present wild and distracted state of things, without counteracting their respective designs and ends, and destroying the very idea of their respective different probations. This is settled by the Scripture. The Jews, for example, were a pattern state, an isolated nation, sequestered by the call of Abraham, regulated by specific statutes in the several historic stages, and instructed and warned by prophetic inspiration. Within that isolated nation, was the church, the children of Abraham by a wholly different institute. Under such a theocracy the greatest philosophical or political reasons might be supposed for a union or identification of the church and state. But God ordained otherwise. Moses was the lawgiver, and Aaron was the priest. Judah sat upon the throne, and Levi ministered at the altar. The regal and sacerdotal were never suffered to interfere. If, at any time they became unlawfully confused, so that the priesthood infringed upon royalty, or royalty upon the priesthood, jarring and revolution immediately ensued. When Saul, the first king of Israel, assumed the functions of a priest, and offered sacrifice, with a view to enlarge his political prerogative, it was treated as sacrilege. God rejected him, and gave the kingdom to another tribe, and another family, the house of

David. "It was only in the last period of the total decline of the Israelitish nation, and shortly before and during the first days of the Roman dominion, that the regal dignity and the office of the high priest were united in one family in such a manner as to correspond with the notion that is at present usually understood by the term theocracy." Schlegel. That abuse signified the approaching overthrow of the nation.

Christianity equally with Judaism excludes all union or interference of the secular and spiritual powers. Our Lord ordered the things of Cæsar and of God to be separately and distinctly rendered. In the case of a fraternal dispute about a question of territorial inheritance, he promptly dismissed the appellant. "Who made me a judge, or a divider over you?" On another memorable occasion he signified his distinctive and peculiar mission by a similar profession: "My kingdom is not of this world; else would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews. But now is my kingdom not from hence." Christianity is for all the nations. It gives them law, moral precepts for every particular man, and ceremonial observances for the *ecclesia*; but not laws, not a code, like that of Moses, for the civil regulation of any people. It embodies the spiritual elements of the old theocracy, but without its national peculiarities. It is never technical and political. Hence it is fitted for men of all nations, states, sections, parties, degrees. Its ministers are commissioned not for the civilization, but the evangelization of the world; to preach Christ crucified and nothing else; and to preach not to a part of men, but to every creature. When they overstep or come short of that commission Christ disowns them. The church, if not secularized by their influence, disowns them. Bad men, whose secular ends can no longer be gained by their indiscreet conformity, or their worse time-serving, also disown them; and they fall out of all fellowship into insignificance or contempt, and, like Judas, go away and hang themselves. Christianity has its own way alone, independent, against the world, which it denounces as evil, but through it, and gathering its trophies out of it, to show forth God's manifold wisdom, not to the prostituted powers of earth, but to "the principalities and powers in heavenly places, according to his eternal purpose in Christ Jesus our Lord." This type of Chris-

tianity is also signified by the church gathered, after the day of pentecost, at Jerusalem. The Christian converts were from all the states of the commercial world. But the states had no recognition, then or afterwards, as having any, and, least of all, any amicable, relation to the church. From the nature of these distinct institutions, such a relation, under any dispensation as yet known, would be clearly impracticable, or its attempt would be practically fatal, as history has shown; and it has formed no part of the divine plan. All the prophetic judgments declared by Christianity, in respect both to church and state, are in connection with the interaction, or interference, or clashes of the ecclesiastical and civil powers. The state cannot be brought up to the level of the church till all things are made new; and when the church descends to the level of the state it is cast out as a withered branch. Its general prostitution, in this respect, is a terrible theme of prophecy, and will mark the period of the Antichrist of the last days, whose universal dominion over the Christianized nations will signalize the demonstration of this world's apostacy, and whose judicial overthrow by God's interposition, will distinguish the apocalyptic battle of the great day of God Almighty.

It is, however, supposable, that a state of things should exist, above the natural and historic order, that is, a state of universal knowledge, wisdom and virtue, in which the civil and ecclesiastical offices would be not only compatible, but actually interpenetrated and subservient to the highest imaginable advancement of the race. All the constituted powers of such a sublime theocracy would be harmonized in showing forth to the universe of intelligent beings, the divine perfections. In the language of bishop Butler:

“Suppose a kingdom or society perfectly virtuous, to which, if you please, may be given a situation advantageous for universal monarchy. The head of such a kingdom would be a monarch in another sense than any mortal has yet been, and the eastern style would be literally applicable to him, that all people, nations and languages should serve him. And though, indeed, our knowledge of human nature, and the whole history of mankind, show the impossibility, without some miraculous interposition, that a number of men here on earth should unite in one society or government in the fear

of God and universal practice of virtue, and that such a government should continue for a succession of ages, yet, admitting or supposing this, the effect would be as here drawn out. And thus, for instance, the wonderful power and prosperity promised to the Jewish nation in Scripture would be, in great measure, the consequence of what is predicted of them, viz. ; that the people should be all righteous and inherit the land forever. The predictions of this kind, for there are many of them, cannot come to pass in the known course of nature, but suppose them to come to pass, and then the dominion and preëminence promised must naturally follow."

But since, as Butler argues, that is an impossibility in the present constitution and course of nature, we must look only for what prophecy and scriptural representation, and not our speculative ideas may promise. The divine, and not any human wisdom, must be our guide, and, meanwhile, quicken our energies for the hastening of the promised state of things. It is Christ's command, and we have observed its special bearing upon educated men: "Occupy till I come." Our work is in the present. Its relation to the future as well as the future itself, belongs to a wisdom above our own. To that wisdom equally belongs our way of doing it; for Platonic and Utopian methods reach not beyond nature, and cannot effect what is impossible under a natural constitution broken up, disordered, and subjecting the whole groaning and travailing creation to the bondage of corruption; as experience not less than the Scripture should by this time have taught us. Otherwise, we merely oscillate between extremes till the violent action and reaction break our social mechanisms in pieces. On the one hand, we just stiffen with Hobbes, and, on the other, dissolve with Paine. Now we forge spiritual fetters with Gregory, and then sever all bonds with the strong-minded women and their eminent collaborators of the present day. Or we are shoved up and down the sliding scale between them, with the better taught civilians and divines, the Burkes, Jeffersons, Franklins and Websters, or the Arnolds and Bunsens, of all times, who honestly and earnestly but vainly aspire to a heaven upon earth without death and a resurrection. Or, yet more fancifully, we look to be translated, and by adding galvanism to steam, to become Enochs and Elijahs, and shoot the gulf in

spite of gravity. Our fiery engines might almost seem to do it; but where would be the cars and passengers? We honor Hobbes and Paine, Gregory and Voltaire, all the superstitions and fanaticisms of all times, for what they are really worth, if it were possible to reckon so small a quantity. Much more do we honor the many worthies up and down between them, for their finer sympathies and chaster intellects, their more corrected tastes and better manners. Let them have the credit of whatever learning, ingenuity, or sincerity they possessed, their sharp criticism of existing evils, and their glowing pictures of an imaginary perfect state. We bear them record for their zeal however ignorant, and sorrow over their ruinous mistakes. But who would leave the light of heaven for their manufactured torches? Who would not lament that they should have substituted their sickly and livid flames for the hallowed fire that burneth on the altar?

That fire ever burneth. It is not for want of light, but of eyes to see it, that society is led about so long, hither and thither, in the wilderness. There is a strait way and a short one to the land of promise, if we cared to walk in it rather than to follow our own perverse judgments or unruly passions. Christianity is not at fault; but our presumptuous unbelief. We are not straitened in God, but in ourselves; and God will be true, though every man be made a liar. Let it be that Christianity has hitherto done so little comparatively for the reformation of mankind, so that a shallow thinker might imagine that any other wisdom would have done as well. Let it be that, notwithstanding its alleged saving power, the nations from east to west have fallen, the nations we mean in distinction from the few righteous for whose sake the earth is spared so long. Let it be that civilization and religion have rolled round till they have almost reached the confines of the globe, leaving behind them so much of decrepitude, barbarism and misery; that race after race has tried its experiment to so little purpose; that the resuscitation of effete nations has hitherto mocked the wisdom of statesmen and the zeal of philanthropists; that our Teutonic civilization, the vigorous offshoot of the old Greek and Roman, is yet profiting so little by the experience of the past, and is now practically confuting that delusive optimism which is "will-

ingly ignorant" of sin and of its predicted judgments, that sees nothing present but flowers and fruits, and nothing future but a glorious harvest. Let it be that Christianity has done so little. Yet, what but little have we of any other good, as things now are in the sin-distracted world, of health, or wealth, of beauty, genius, learning, power, success; of sympathy, help, encouragement, of pleasant memories and cheerful hopes; and that little mixed with so much evil in our best conditions, and presently taken from us before it can be called our own?

Be it so. But what is that little, not in degree, but quality and effect, as compared with the paganism which Christianity has not supplanted, or the infidelity which hisses at it, or the antichristianism of the modern Rome, Byzantium, or Athens, that has interpreted its virtue out of it? If it be little, what is that little, to have tempered the asperities of its own contentious sects; to have raised and invigorated otherwise inert and lifeless masses, or checked and balanced their destructive agencies, and diffused through long dark ages of credulity and superstition, a leaven of art and learning, and restraining reverence, that has given to its own apostate nations so great social and political preëminence above the barbarous nations of the earth? What is now that little in these ends of the earth to which Christianity has retreated from the lands of its nativity, that in our families, villages and cities, our schools and colleges, our governments and laws, our labor, trade and commerce, a conservative element should exist with power to regulate, in measure, the social movement, and produce a civilization so rapid, prosperous and brilliant, that even Christian men, dazzled by the worldly splendor, have rejoiced in the illusion as significant of a speedy return to paradise, and already stretched out their hand to the tree of life; as if "the cherubim and the flaming sword" were not still ordained to keep us back? They too have mistaken the apparent for the real, the interpretation for the text. For the *palingenesia* is not so. It is not yet; though it will yet be.

But, if, in the way of cavil and objection, it should be still argued, that Christianity is not worth much if it fail to realize our speculative hopes and its own predictions as interpreted by the philosophers and politicians everywhere, let such persons

inquire what would be the natural consequence, if its light, such as it now reflects, should be quenched, and a sheer naturalism succeed? There are not wanting large portions of the world to which, if Christianity be not absolutely unknown, it has not penetrated with any practical effect, or from which it has been, for centuries, practically excluded. It were mere affectation to pretend that the so called Christian nations, if the light of Christianity, such as it is, were withdrawn from them, have any advantages which those countries had not for social and political advancement, or would not, in due time, be equally degraded. If any country could claim such advantages it would be our own, on whatever grounds the reckoning should be made. Let it then be supposed that the experiment were here attempted, not of abolishing Christianity by legislative enactments or popular violence, but of overshadowing and insensibly annulling it by the more ordinary process of secularization; by the fashionable insinuation of a worldly spirit, the gradual substitution of speculative conceits, of learned mythologies, of a licentious literature, of aesthetic entertainments, of mere philanthropic enterprise, political agitations, the arts of diplomacy, or the pomp, parade and circumstance of war. Let it be supposed that in our upward intellectual and material career, we should become giddy from the very height of our greatness, and that, looking abroad upon the outspread panorama of the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, we should, for the sake of the proffered boon, fall down and worship the lying spirit. Let it be supposed that the more distinctively religious classes should lose their proportion to the rapidly increasing native and foreign population, and, gradually, their restraining influence upon the body politic; that the church should consequently become stationary or retrogressive, subsiding into indifference, or stimulating itself unnaturally with ambitious and romantic hopes, or wasting its energies in political or sectarian controversies. Let it be supposed that this professed expectant of a heavenly kingdom should join in the universal physical activity, multiply its outside organizations, and exhaust its spirit in working its apparatus. Let it be supposed that while it was becoming lavish in its furniture and adornments, proud in its gorgeous display, fantastic in its movements, and boastful of its worldly patron-

age and prospective conquests, the heavenly fire was going out upon its altars. Let it be supposed that the church and the state should imperceptibly lose their balance and proportion, and now become mutually repulsive, or again, coalesce for a common political effect. Let us suppose their respective venerated institutions to fall off insensibly from their old foundations; that the oracles should give out wild and contradictory responses; and, amidst the subtleties of philosophical dispute, the envenomed sophistries and falsehoods of partisan or sectarian controversy, the heats of popular harangue, and the uncertainties of loose and inconsistent interpretations, society should become more and more excited and distracted; that the common atmosphere should be filled with murky vapors; that governments, politics, arts, science, commerce, trades, should crowd, every one upon every other, and all be driven onwards in fitful and phrenzied movement. Let us suppose that to the bewildered and infatuated people all this unnatural activity should seem only to indicate the march of a more vigorous civilization; that its progress should be hailed from every hill-top, its hosannas be rung in every temple, and the wild cry of the intoxicated thousands should be held as the voice of God heralding the material and political, and, by an absurd consequence, the moral, renovation of the world. What, upon these suppositions, would become of the last, the westernmost, the best, the most highly privileged of the nations, when, as so often before in history, its highest, proudest, most magnificent and exultant civilization should be weighed in the balances of moral government, and the fiery letters should come out upon the wall: Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin? Could philosophy guide us in such difficulties? Could it save us in such extremities? Would the deceitful cause of these evils be also their remedy and cure?

These suppositions are not impossible; for such things have been, or all history misleads us. They are sufficient, therefore, to call for the greatest consideration of educated men, and to awaken a deeper sense of their difficult responsibilities. Christian scholars will not refuse to see things as they are, to be cautioned and corrected. We are assured, in regard to the great questions which invite them, that "The wise shall

understand." But the true wisdom dwells not in "haunts obscure of old philosophy." None of the princes of this world have known it. "But the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God," and it is his province to show them to the humble; and it is theirs to speak them, "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth," comparing spiritual things, not with the natural, but with the spiritual, making God his own interpreter. That promised Spirit waits for our call out of a lowly mind, in the utterances of a contrite heart. "The meek will he guide in judgment, and the meek will he teach his way." Whoever is emptied of himself will be filled with the fulness of God.

ARTICLE II.

EARLY LIFE OF GOVERNOR WINTHROP.

The Life and Letters of John Winthrop, Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Company at their Emigration to New England, 1630.
By ROBERT C. WINTHROP. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.
1864.

WE do not know when any biography has been more welcome to us than this. It meets a real want in the annals of New England, and we wish it might be followed by the lives of others of those ancient worthies, now so dimly seen, and fast fading out of sight as to their individual characters. It is a strengthening, inspiring book for these gloomy days of war; a book that increases one's faith in God and humanity; a book of lessons for young and old. Its origin is detailed in the introductory chapter. The author, on a brief visit to England in 1847, "ran down" to spend a Sunday in the home of his ancestors, the little town of Groton, Suffolk. He joins in the service at the same church where they had worshipped; he finds their tomb in the churchyard, and, by a striking coincidence, just repaired,

almost as if in anticipation of the arrival of one who might be presumed to take a peculiar interest in its condition"; and he searches out the traces of their home, "the outlines of the cellar, and one old mulberry-tree still standing in what was probably the garden-plot," being all that is left to mark the spot. He finds a story current there that the Winthrops were regicides, and had fled to America, leaving money buried somewhere about the family precincts.

"Perhaps," says he, "it was supposed that I had come over to search for it! At any rate, I believe it was the monstrosity of this tradition which prompted the resolution which I then formed that I would employ my earliest leisure from public occupation in rendering an act of filial justice to my progenitors. I did not, indeed, imagine that this absurd story had obtained currency or credit anywhere except where I heard it, or that there were not those on the spot who understood its utterly apocryphal character; and certainly I did not forget that here, in New England, there are memorials enough, both of the elder and the younger Winthrop, to leave no room for such a mistake as this, even in the mind of any well educated school-boy. But it is not the less true, that there has been no extended biography of either of them; nor any book containing such an account of their lives, services and characters, as would be likely to render them familiar to the modern public mind."

There is no doubt that the book will, according to the author's expressed wish, "do its own proper work of justification with those into whose hands it shall fall." Its style, no less than its subject, will bespeak not only attention but admiration.

The biographer traces back the family name in its varied orthography, through six and a half centuries. The first of the family of whom he gives any account, is Adam Winthrop (the grandfather of the Massachusetts Governor), who was born in 1498, at Lavenham, Suffolk, and passed the most of his life in London, becoming a distinguished member, and finally master, of the ancient and honorable company of Clothworkers. His son Adam was born in London in 1548; and Groton, formerly the lordship of the Abbot of Bury, having at the dissolution of the monasteries some years before, been granted to the father, it fell to his second son, Adam, in the distribution of the family estate. This Adam was a man of intelligence and scholarship,

intermingled with perhaps not a little pedantry. Some of his poetry is preserved, and extracts are given in the volume before us, of which we might say with the author, that "many 'runder verses' have fallen from 'old and barren braynes' both in that day and in this." He was addicted to keeping a diary, which, whatever may be said of the habit in general, proves in this case to have been most fortunate, as it supplies much information as to dates and places which could not otherwise now be obtained. It gives us a pleasant picture of an English home ;

"all things in order stored,
The haunt of ancient Peace."

Adam Winthrop was twice married, John being the child of his second marriage, and the only son. He was born at Edwardston (a little village adjoining Groton, where his mother's parents lived), Jan. 12, 1587. Did our space permit, we would willingly linger with the father, of whom many interesting traits are cited in this book, and whose death at a good old age is thus beautifully commemorated by his son :

"He hath finished his course ; and is gathered to his people in peace, as the ripe corn into the barn. He thought long for the day of his dissolution, and welcomed it most gladly. Thus is he gone before ; and we must go after, in our time. This advantage he hath of us ; he shall not see the evil which we may meet with ere we go hence. Happy those who stand in good terms with God and their own conscience ; they shall not fear evil tidings ; and in all changes they shall be the same."—p. 179.

No details of John Winthrop's childhood have been preserved. His father's diary proves him to have been entered at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1602. He seems to have remained there but about two years, during which time, his "Christian Experience" tells us, being afflicted with a "lingering fever," he "betook himself to God" with much mourning for his past life, which he characterizes as "wild and dissolute," though there is no other testimony to this effect, and much to the contrary. At seventeen he was married and at eighteen he was a father. The accounts of the betrothal and marriage are scanty, being a few concise, matter-of-fact entries by the never failing diarist, Adam Winthrop, of which this is the longest :

"The viiith of May, 1605, my soonne & his wife came to Groton from London, and the ixth I made a marriage feaste when S^r Thomas Mildmay & his lady my sister were present. The same day my sister Veysye came to me, & departed on the 24th of Maye. My dawter Fones came the viiith of Maye & departed home the xxiii^d of May."—p. 59.

We are left to imagine the merry-makings of the family party upon this joyful occasion. The name of the bride was Mary Forth, daughter and sole heir of John Forth, Esq., of Great Stambridge. Winthrop's early marriage no doubt occasioned his withdrawal from college, but he seems to have had no reason to regret the step. On the contrary, besides the social happiness which it brought him, he expresses himself as circumstantially indebted thereto for his establishment in the faith of Christ.

"About eighteen years of age," he says in his "Christian Experience," "I married into a family under Mr. Culverwell his ministry in Essex; and living there sometimes, I first found the ministry of the word come home to my heart with power; (for in all before I found only light)"—was the work of the Holy Spirit ever better distinguished from the work of conscience?—"and after that, I found the like in the ministry of many others; so as there began to be some change; which I perceived in myself, and others took notice of. Now I began to come under strong exercises of conscience; (yet by fits only); I could no longer dally with religion. God put my soule to sad tasks sometimes, which yet the flesh would shake off and outwear still. I had, withal, many sweet invitations; which I would willingly have entertained, but the flesh would not give up her interest. The merciful Lord would not thus be answered; but notwithstanding all my stübbornnesse, and unkind rejections of mercy, hee left mee not till hee had overcome my heart to give itself up unto him, and to bid farewell to all the world, and until my heart could answer, 'Lord! what wilt thou have me to do?'"

"Now I came to some peace and comfort in God, and in his wayes; my chief delight was therein. I loved a Christian, and the very ground hee went upon. I honored a faithful minister in my heart, and could have kissed his feet. Now I grew full of zeal, (which outrane my knowledge and carried mee sometimes beyond my calling) and very liberall to any good work. I had an unsatiable thirst after the word of God; and could not misse a good sermon, though many miles off, especially of such as did search deep into the conscience."—p. 60.

On which record the biographer justly remarks, and with much of comfort to pastors whose fields of labor are in Bethlehem rather than Jerusalem :

“ The humble village curate, to whose faithful ministry the father of the Massachusetts Colony has thus traced his earliest and strongest impressions of the power of the word, may well be considered to have earned a title to remembrance which many a lordly prelate of his day might have envied.”

John Winthrop and his wife left the paternal home for their own dwelling at Stambridge in October, 1608. Mary Winthrop died in June, 1615, leaving her husband at twenty-eight, with six children, the oldest of whom was but little over nine. She is spoken of by him in his private papers as “ a right godly woman.”

Winthrop married in December, 1615, Thomasine Clopton, daughter of William Clopton, Esq., of Castleins, a seat near Groton. She died and was buried with her infant child after one short year of wedded life. Winthrop's account of her last sickness is most touching. On the last day of her life which was the Sabbath,

“ When most of the companie were gone downe to dinner, when I discoursed unto hir of the sweet love of Christ unto hir, & of the glorie that she was goeing unto, & what a holye everlastinge Sabbath she should keepe, & how she should suppe wth Christ in Paradise that night, etc. ; she shewed by hir speeches & gestures the great ioye & steadfast assurance that she had of those things. When I told hir that hir Redeemer lived, & that she should see him wth those poore dimme eyes, w^{ch} should be bright & glorified, she answered cheerfully, she should. When I told hir that she should leave the societie of friends w^{ch} were full of infirmities, & should have communiō wth Abram, Isaacke & Jacob, all the prophets & apostles & saints of God, & those holy martirs, she would lifte up hir hands & eyes, & say, yea she should. Suche comforte had she ag^t deathe that she steadfastly professed that if life were sett before hir she would not take it.”—p. 87.

In 1618, we find Winthrop again married ; this time to Margaret Tyndal, daughter of Sir John Tyndal of Great Maplested, Essex. This marriage seems to have been most agreeable to Adam Winthrop, for we find a letter from him to his future daughter expressing, in most affectionate terms, his desire to

see her a member of his family. The Tyndal family do not seem to have been at first much pleased with the match, but Margaret adhered to her resolution, and the wedding took place in April, 1618. For the next ten or twelve years there is little that is remarkable, though much that is interesting, in the family history. Winthrop's professional duties often called him to London, and at such times he maintained an affectionate and frequent correspondence with the home circle. His letters to his wife and hers to him form one of the most valuable portions of this volume and we shall refer to them again. His eldest son John was a student at Trinity college, Dublin, and afterwards a law student in London. His father's letters to him are truly, in the language of the biographer, "models of old-fashioned paternal advice and affectionate counsel." He says in one of them :

"I will not limit your allowance less than to the uttermost of mine own estate. So as, if £20 be too little (as I always accounted it), you shall have £30; and when that shall not suffice, you shall have more. Only hold a sober and frugal course, (yet without baseness) and I will shorten myself to enlarge you." p. 177. And again : "I see, by your epistle, that you have not spent this year past in idleness, but have profited even beyond my expectations. The Lord grant that thy soul may still prosper in the knowledge of Jesus Christ, and in the strength of the Spirit, as thy mind is strengthened in wisdom and learning; for this gives the true lustre and beauty to all gifts both of nature and industry, and is as wisdom with an inheritance." p. 179. "I doubt not but if it please the Lorde to reveale himselfe once in you & to lett you taste & see howe good he is, and what the worthe of Christ is to those who finde him, what riches, what pleasures, what wisdom, what peace & contentatiō is to be founde in Christ alone, you will willingly forsake all to follow him."—p. 184.

In 1627 the younger John Winthrop joined the expedition under command of the Duke of Buckingham for the relief of the French Protestants at Rochelle. Here is his father's farewell letter. Surely "it could serve as well for one going to fight the battles of his country to-day, as it did two hundred and thirty-five years ago."

"Only be careful to seek the Lord in the first place and with all earnestness as He who is only able to keep you in all perils, and to give you favor in the sight of those who may be instruments of your

welfare; and account it a great point of wisdom to keep diligent watch over yourself, that you may neither be infected by the evil conversation of any that you may be forced to converse with, neither that your own speech or behavior be any just occasion to hurt or ensnare you. Be not rash, upon ostentation of valor, to adventure yourself to unnecessary dangers; but if you be lawfully called, let it appear that you hold your life for Him who gave it you, and will preserve it unto the farthest period of His own holy decree. For you may be resolved that while you keep in your way, all the canons or enemies in the world shall not be able to shorten your days one minute."—p. 242.

After his return from this expedition, the younger Winthrop seems to have had some desire to emigrate to New England. This was discouraged by the father who "was loath that his son should settle there yet," but prefers his "going and coming awhile, and afterwards to do as God shall offer occasion." He finally concluded upon an oriental tour, which occupied him for about fourteen months.

Many changes had during the last few years taken place in Winthrop family. Adam Winthrop, the beloved father, had died; John Winthrop, senior, had suffered a severe and painful illness; his son Henry (afterwards drowned at Salem, Massachusetts), had caused him much anxiety by his wayward conduct; and in 1629 the loss of the office of Attorney of the Court of Wards and Liveries, which he had held for some years, and the anticipations which he seems to have entertained of approaching political troubles, may have added their weight to the other motives in favor of a voluntary exile from his native land. The first distinct intimation of such a design is given in the reply of his son to a letter now lost, which had evidently spoken of his intention to emigrate. The younger Winthrop says:

"For myself, I have seen so much of the vanity of the world, that I esteem no more of the diversities of countries, than as so many inns, whereof the traveller that hath lodged in the best or in the worst, findeth no difference when he cometh to his journey's end; and I shall call that my country where I may most glorify God, and enjoy the presence of my dearest friends. Therefore herein I submit myself to God's will and yours, and with your leave, do dedicate myself (laying by all desire of other employments whatsoever) to

the service of God and the Company herein, with the whole endeavors both of body and mind."—p. 307.

And now were commenced in earnest the preparations for seeking a home in the New World. With an earnest desire to do all to the glory of God, and a firm conviction that duty called him across the sea, are mingled tender natural regrets at leaving his native land, as he truly prophesied, to see it no more. His letters to his wife, whose circumstances prevented her from accompanying him, grew more and more tender as the parting day approached. Being chosen Governor of the Company, his public cares are much increased, and he has also to provide for his own family in many matters needful. But he finds time for one more visit, and a lingering farewell to the Groton home and its dear inmates, and then, after long delays, and innumerable vexations, he sets sail, having agreed that he and his Margaret should "meet in spirit before the Lord" every Monday and Friday evening between the hours of five and six.

Winthrop and his companions embarked March 22, 1630. He was at this time forty-three years of age. At this point the historian leaves him, with the modest observation, "We can hardly hope to add much to the account of the latter part of his life, although we are not without some new original letters and papers pertaining to it." But we trust that the author will not let his labor of love stop so far short of the wishes of his readers. Winthrop's Letters to his Wife give us a view of his character without which his portraiture would lack some of its most attractive features. The few letters given in the appendix to "Winthrop's New England" have often made us wish for more. The author of the present memorial devotes much space to these precious relics of a love as pure and devoted as the world has ever seen. We wish we could find room for a few extracts.

Margaret Winthrop's letters are in their way no wise inferior to her husband's either in feeling or expression. Indeed all the glimpses which we get of her through the course of this volume show her to have been a true help-meet for her honored husband, sharing cheerfully with him temporal joys and sorrows, and united with him in one hope of eternal life.

Winthrop's letters to his wife during the weeks preceding his

embarkation for America abound in expressions of the most heartfelt tenderness as well as the most courageous faith. In one of these last he says, for we can not resist the quoting of it :

“ And now (my sweet soul) I must once again take my last farewell of thee in Old England. It goeth very near to my heart to leave thee ; but I know to whom I have committed thee, even to him who loves thee much better than any husband can, who hath taken account of the hairs of thy head, and puts all thy tears in his bottle, who can and (if it be for his glory) will bring us together again with peace and comfort. Oh, how it refresheth my heart to think that I shall yet again see thy sweet face in the land of the living ! that lovely countenance that I have so much delighted in, and beheld with so great content ! . . . Yet if all these hopes should fail, blessed be our God, that we are assured we shall meet one day, if not as husband and wife, yet in a better condition. Let that stay and comfort thy heart. Neither can the sea drown thy husband, nor enemies destroy, nor any adversity deprive thee of thy husband or children. Therefore I will only take thee now and my sweet children in mine arms, and kiss and embrace you all, and so leave you with my God. Farewell, farewell.”—p. 378.

The “ Christian Experience ” of Winthrop, from which we have already quoted a few sentences, was drawn up by himself in New England and signed on his forty-ninth birth day. Extracts from it form a deeply interesting chapter in the volume before us. It is full of the most searching condemnation of his “ awful heart ” and the most vivid apprehension of eternal things.

John Winthrop was a Puritan of the highest type. Sincerely persuaded, as were his companions in emigration, that the enterprise of building up a new state in a foreign land was a work most agreeable to God as conducive to his glory in the establishment of religious institutions upon a firmer foundation than was possible in their native land, he was more steadfast than were some of them, in overcoming the difficulties and enduring the hardships of the task. Bancroft says :

“ As the hour of departure drew near, the consciousness of danger spread such terrors that even the hearts of the strong began to fail. One and another of the magistrates declined. It became

necessary to hold a court at Southampton for the election of three substitutes among the assistants; and of these three one never went. . . . It was principally the calm decision of Winthrop that sustained the courage of his companions."

We would fain hope that the great religious truths which were the basis of the Puritanic faith, and the Puritanic integrity, have not wholly faded out of New England's life. We do not claim that Puritanism was perfection, or that a restoration of all its features would be desirable, even if it were possible; but we believe that its defects were but specks on the surface of a sun whose beams had power to evoke from a strange and unfriendly soil such growths as no other influence could have produced; such fruits of energy as to-day make New England and the states of which she is the foster-mother, a wonder and a praise among the nations; such fruits of courage and indomitable patience as are to-day redeeming the land from a foe to its prosperity worse than any which our fathers had to encounter. One of our greatest American historians has spoken thus wisely and with generous appreciation of the work of Puritanism:

"Historians have loved to eulogize the manners and virtues, the glory and the benefits of chivalry. Puritanism accomplished for mankind far more. If it had the sectarian crime of intolerance, chivalry had the vices of dissoluteness. The knights were brave from gallantry of spirit; the Puritans from the fear of God. The knights were proud of loyalty; the Puritans of liberty. The knights did homage to monarchs in whose smile they beheld honor, whose rebuke was the wound of disgrace; the Puritans, disdaining ceremony, would not bend the knee to the King of kings. The former valued courtesy; the latter liberty. The former adorned society by graceful refinements; the latter founded national grandeur on universal education. The institutions of chivalry were subverted by the gradually increasing weight, and knowledge, and opulence of the industrious classes; the Puritans, relying upon those classes, planted in their hearts the undying principles of democratic liberty."

ARTICLE III.

THE GREEK TEXT IN ACTS, xx. 28: 1 TIMOTHY, iii. 16: AND 1 JOHN, v. 7, 8.

ACTS xx. 28. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which [*or church of the Lord which, or church of the Lord God which, or church which*] he hath purchased with his own blood."

1 TIM. iii. 16. "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest, [*or which was manifest; or who was manifest*] in the flesh."

1 JOHN v. 7, 8. "There are three that bear record in (heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in) earth, the spirit and the water and the blood: and these three agree in one: *or* there are three that bear record in [*omitting all in the parenthesis*] earth, the spirit and the water and the blood; and these three agree in one."

It was not till about a century after the art of printing was discovered that there was any printed copy of the Greek New Testament. It then appeared in the Complutensian Polyglot, which was issued under the patronage of Cardinal Ximenes. From that edition Erasmus, R. Stephens, Beza, and Elzevir published Greek Testaments, differing only by very slight variations. Thus the Greek text of the Complutensian Polyglot came into general use with only some variations that will be noted in the sequel.

It is from that Received Text that all the deviations are usually reckoned. Stephens, in his splendid edition, having collated fifteen mss. besides the Complutensian edition, noted a variety of readings in the margin. Elzevir, from whose edition the Received Text is properly reckoned, very closely followed the editions of Beza, and the third edition of Stephens; and the third edition of Stephens followed very closely the fifth edition of Erasmus; except in some places where he thought the Complutensian preferable to that of Erasmus.

But Curcellæus and bishop Fell collated more mss. than Stephens; and their editions greatly augmented the number of

"various readings." Dr. Mill, in his elaborate edition of the Greek Testament, computed the various readings to be about thirty thousand. Then the labors of subsequent collators of mss. augmented these to more than fifty thousand, the most of which, however, were no variations in the sense.

Then it was that Bengel and Semler proposed the plan of classifying and collating all the mss. Dr. Bentley, (Letters of 1807, London edition,) had projected the like plan of disposing of the immense number of "various readings." Thus he said :

"Reflecting upon some of the passages of St. Jerome ; that he had adjusted and castigated the then Latin Vulgate to the best Greek exemplars ; and had kept the very order of the words of the the original ; I formed a thought, *a priori*, that if St. Jerome's true Latin exemplar could now be come at, it would be found to agree exactly with the Greek text of that age ; and so the old copies of each language, if so agreeing, would give mutual proof and even demonstration of each other."

Thus he formed the plan of a corrected text which should agree with the Vulgate as corrected by Jerome.

But these schemes were superseded by the elaborate work of Griesbach. His project for classifying Greek mss. instead of depending upon Jerome, who flourished in the fifth century, was to build upon that of Origen, who flourished in the third century ; and instead of two kinds of text, one of which is conformed to the Latin Vulgate, and the other to the generality of Greek mss., he contemplated three classes ; which he denominated the Alexandrine, the Western, and the Byzantine, from the regions where each was supposed to prevail. A choice among these texts he determined by the authority of Origen, because of the great attention which he gave to biblical criticism. But he made no allowance for the whims of Origen. Believing that there was a striking coincidence between Origen's scripture quotations, and the celebrated ms. brought from Alexandria in Egypt, he denominated those that agreed most nearly with that the Alexandrine mss. Those that differed from this, and coincided with those which came from Constantinople and its vicinity, he called the Byzantine mss. A third class, which were found chiefly in Europe, and which coincided with

the Latin version, where they differ from the peculiar readings of the other two classes, he denominated the Western mss.

But to the so called Alexandrine mss. Griesbach ascribed the highest rank; making a very few of them outweigh a multitude of the Byzantine mss. Thus the peculiar readings which he selected from the Alexandrine mss., and which were confirmed by the Fathers, and versions, he pronounced "genuine and authentic." These he introduced into his emended text; giving unreasonable authority to Origen, and distressing the minds of many Christians. "For if the foundations be destroyed, what shall the righteous do?"

But they may dismiss all such unnecessary fears. For the subject of various readings, which have been set forth in great capitals as fifty thousand, may be brought into a very small compass, so far as the doctrinal purity of the Greek text is concerned. For most of the various readings are slight and unimportant, relating to punctuation or orthography. It is indeed marvellous that the doctrines of the New Testament are touched but little, if we make the exception of the three texts under consideration. In the first of these Griesbach has "church of the Lord" instead of "church of God"; in the second he has $\delta\varsigma$ for $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$; "who was manifest in the flesh"; and he expunges 1 John v. 7, 8, as an interpolation.

Let all this be borne in mind while we proceed to examine the work of Griesbach. For, while we concede much honor to him for learned and patient labor in collating mss. versions and the fathers; and also in directing us to the sources of evidence; we dissent entirely from his classification of mss., and also from his decision that the Alexandrine outweigh both the Byzantine and the Western mss.

Thus Dr. Nolin, in his "Inquiry into the integrity of the Greek Vulgate," says of Griesbach:

"In his predilection for the Alexandrine text, which he conceives that he has discovered in the works of Origen, I am far from acquiescing; for I cannot see that M. Griesbach has evinced that the text used by Origen was the Alexandrine rather than the Byzantine. The fact is that Origen lived and died in a state of excommunication from that church, in which his principles were execrated, and his writings condemned. And the principal part of his commentaries

were published in Palestine instead of Alexandria. In adopting a text the Alexandrine church was not influenced by him, nor was he influenced by their text. But he followed the copies of the country in which his writings were published and dispersed."

There is great force in this testimony of Dr. Nolin. Besides, we are assured by Jerome that "Palestine adopted the text of Origen"; while "Alexandria adopted that of Hesychius." Thus we discover that Griesbach made a most stupendous mistake at the threshold in his classification of MSS.

Still further; by Griesbach's own showing, the Alexandrine MSS. were not worthy of being considered as authoritative; for he says; "They are fouled and corrupted in almost every page."

And is it not amazing, that while the Byzantine and the Western are to be reckoned by hundreds, and while they are remarkably coincident with each other, Griesbach should have made the Alexandrine MSS. the basis with which to compare MSS., the fathers and versions; while he admits that they were so corrupted; and that he should make the very few of these to outweigh hundreds of the other MSS.? For, it must be remarked in passing, that Matthæi has collated about six hundred MSS.

We may, therefore, and we should conclude, that Griesbach is fundamentally erroneous.

We next proceed to show that the Byzantine text should be the basis with which to compare all the rest. For it is admitted on all hands that the Byzantine text can be traced through more than fourteen centuries without interruption; and during that long period there is a remarkable agreement in the MSS.

Besides, when we attempt to go back beyond these fourteen centuries, the first thing that interrupts the series is the ascendancy of the Arians for about forty years; in which period Eusebius of Cæsarea made a revision of the text. We shall hereafter show how Eusebius might have let drop the celebrated text of the three witnesses. But our design now is to carry up the Byzantine text beyond that period of forty years. Jerome's testimony helps us through the difficulty. For he says that "the text which prevailed at Byzantium was not the one edited by Eusebius, but the one that was edited by Lucianus." And

thus is it made clear that the Byzantine text is the one that prevailed within two hundred years of the apostles. Surely, then, that should be the basis of comparison in all attempts at emending the Greek text.

But it is next necessary to go into the subject of the earliest revisions of the sacred text, to discover if possible what other interruptions there were in the series of MSS. in reaching the very age of the apostles.

There is evidence that no attempts were made to amend the text before the time of Origen. We may here advert to what was done by Hesychius and Lucianus to remove the objections which had been made to the text of Origen. Both of these fathers attempted to remove errors. Lucianus directed his attention to the Old Testament; and Hesychius to the New. But their one great design was to remove the errors which had arisen from transcribers and from the criticisms of Origen. Here Jerome comes to our aid; showing that Lucianus and Hesychius published the vulgar Greek text, the common edition: "*Quæ Græci κοινή dicuntur, et in toto orbe diversa est.*"

Thus it will be seen that we carry up our Greek vulgate, the Received Text, to the very age of the apostles. For we before carried it around the forty years of the Arian heresy; and here we carry it beyond the tampering of Origen.

We now ask biblical scholars if the Byzantine text does not stand on a platform far above that of the Alexandrine MSS., which are "fouled and corrupted on almost every page"?

We now proceed to show that Griesbach transgressed his own rules. And what were those rules?

"Every emendation should be made by the weight of authority of MSS., the Christian fathers, and versions of the New Testament." Yet, while he admitted that the Alexandrine "were fouled and corrupted in almost every page," he allowed them a weight of authority above both the Byzantine and the Western when they agree, and he accounted a few MSS., two or three in one passage, of the Alexandrine MSS. to outweigh hundreds of both the Byzantine and the Western. And, before we are through, we shall endeavor to make it apparent that the Alexandrine MSS. on which he depended have been affected by the revision of Eusebius; for they have his divisions and sections.

Besides, the versions by which Griesbach would confirm the authority of the Alexandrine against both the Byzantine and the Western MSS. give no additional weight of testimony; for they also have the divisions and sections of Eusebius, and of course they are either the descendants of the text of Eusebius, or else have been accommodated to it. In either case they add nothing to the authority of the Alexandrine text. These versions are the Sahidic, the Coptic, the Armenian, the later Syriac, and the Erpenian Arabic. But they are not independent witnesses because they have the sections and divisions above referred to.

We come now to the real weight of authority for Griesbach's emendations.

Upon Acts xx. 28, for ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ κυρίου instead of Θεοῦ, there are ten MSS., and these are confirmed only by those versions that have the divisions of Eusebius.

But against the adoption of κυρίου for Θεοῦ all the Latin MSS. without a single exception have Deus; and they thus support the Byzantine or Received Greek text. There are also fifteen Greek MSS. that have Θεοῦ, and fifty Greek MSS. that have κυρίου Θεοῦ. And therefore it might be assumed that κυρίου Θεοῦ was the true text; that Θεοῦ had happened to be dropped out of the ten MSS. and κυρίου out of the fifteen by the carelessness of transcribers. If we now appeal to the quotations of the Christian fathers, who lived anterior to the date of any of the Greek MSS. that have come down to us; we shall find that the term "church of God which he purchased with his own blood" was in both the Latin and Greek texts before the revision of Eusebius.

Thus Ignatius speaks of our being saved ἐν αἵματι Θεοῦ. And he went on to reason from it thus; Εἰς ἱατρός ἐστιν σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικός, γεννητός καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος Θεός.

Tertullian, Lib. II. says; "Quod sciam, non sumus nostri; sed pretio empti; et quali pretio? Sanguine Dei." Can any one question whether Tertullian here referred to Acts xx. 28?

Athanasius, one hundred years later than Tertullian, writes: Ο ὁ Παῦλος ἐν ᾧ ἡμεῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπίσκοπος πομαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἣν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος.

Basil also quotes the text in nearly the same words. Epiphanius also quotes it precisely after the form adopted by Athanasius.

asius. Ambrose thus writes; "Dixit enim Paulus; attendite vobis et omni gregi in quo posuit vos Spiritus Sanctus Episcopos regere ecclesiam Dei," etc.

Chrysostom in his forty-fourth Homily, ninth book, quotes the Greek Vulgate as has been mentioned concerning Athanasius and Epiphanius. And great numbers of both Greek and Latin fathers quoted this text in the age that followed that of Eusebius; as Ibas, Celestinus, Fulgentius, Primasius, Etherius, Antiochus, Cœcumenius and Theophylact.

If it were necessary to add to this amount of evidence, we would say that "church of the Lord" is no where the *usus loquendi* of scriptural writers; while "the church of God" occurs eleven times.

Now we ask if Griesbach's authority for substituting *κυρίου* for *θεοῦ* in Acts xx. 28, be not reduced to a very slight foundation?

He had still less authority for his reading in 1 Tim. iii. 16: *ὁς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί*. For none of the versions made before the fourth century have *ὁς*; while the old Italic version, the first probably that ever was made, has *Deus*; plainly showing what was the original text. Besides, all the versions that have *ὁς* instead of *θεός* have either been accommodated to the text of Eusebius, or copied from it; for they have his sections and divisions.

Still further; Griesbach had only three MSS. in favor of amending this text by inserting *ὁς*, instead of *θεός*; while all known MSS. both Greek and Latin from the East and the West, give the Received Text, "God was manifest in the flesh"; and still further, the Received Text was quoted and reasoned upon by no less than eight of the most eminent of the fathers of the church; viz., Ignatius, Hippolytus, Athanasius, Gregory Nyssa, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, and Euthalius. Ignatius wrote in the apostolic age, being a disciple and companion of the apostles, and Hippolytus in the age that followed. In the next age we have Athanasius, Gregory Nyssa and Chrysostom; and in the next, Euthalius, Theodoret and Cyril of Alexandria.

Besides, if it were shown that *ὁς* instead of *θεός* were the true text, what is the antecedent to which it refers? It cannot be *μυστήριον*; for the gender will not allow it. But, if it would,

what is its meaning? Was it a mystery that was manifest in the flesh? That would be more unintelligible than that "God was manifest in the flesh." Does it then refer to *θεός* in a preceding verse? If so then we should have "God *who* was manifest in the flesh."

We may further remark that Dr. Bloomfield says, in loco, that it "has been proved irrefragably by Matthæi, Burton and others, that the testimony of the Greek fathers upon the whole is decidedly in favor of *θεός*."

We will now look at 1 John v. 7, 8, which Griesbach pronounces "an interpolation."

In the beginning of our argument we observe that all the evidence against the genuineness of this passage is that it is not contained in the earliest Greek MSS. that have come down to us; and that it is not in quite all the Latin MSS., though it is in most of them. It was on this account that the Protestant Reformers marked it as doubtful.

But, if we can prove that it was in the texts both Greek and Latin, before the revision of Eusebius, then we can show more easily how it could have been left out by him, than that it could have been in the text during the three centuries preceding his time, if it were not genuine and authentic.

It certainly was in the text in the second century; for Tertullian thus referred to it; "Ita connexus Patris in Filio, et Filii in Paracleto tres efficit cohærentes, alterum ex altero, qui tres unum sunt; non unus quando dictum est; ego et Pater unum sumus; ad substantiæ unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem."

In the age that followed, Cyprian the bishop of Carthage, thus writes in his "De unitate ecclesiæ"; "Dixit Dominus ego et Pater unum sumus, et de Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est; et hi tres unum sunt." We observe his language, "scriptum est"; for it was the usual mode of the Christian fathers in referring to the authority of the Scriptures.

In the age following that of Cyprian, we may quote "Phœbadius contra Arianos": for after referring to the promise of Christ to give the Comforter, he says; "Sic alius a Filio Spiritus; sicut alius a patre Filius. Sic tertia in Spiritu ut in Filio secunda persona, unus tamen omnia quia tres unum sunt."

In the same age Marcus Celedensis wrote; "Nobis unus Pater, et unus Filius ejus, verus Deus, et unus Spiritus Sanctus, verus Deus; et hi tres unum sunt; una divinitas, et potentia, et regnum."

How could all those fathers have thus written had not this passage 1 John v. 7, 8, been in the text? And how could the whole Western church have given their testimony incidentally to its authenticity, had it not been in the text?

That the whole African church received it is apparent from what occurred at Carthage, when between three and four hundred prelates were assembled; for Fulgentius, who drew up their confession, thus quotes St. John, the Evangelist, on the doctrine of the trinity: "Tres sunt, inquit, qui testimonium perhibent in terra, aqua, sanguis, et caro; et hi tres unum sunt; et tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent in cœlo; Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus; et hi tres unum sunt."

Observe here how improbable it is that nearly four hundred bishops should quote such a text, if it were not in the original? And how can we account for its being in the text if it was not there from the beginning of Christianity?

Fulgentius, Marcus Celedensis, Cyprian and Tertullian were Africans; and they have all referred to this passage as if it were a part of their Bible. Besides, it is in the earliest version of the New Testament that was made; and in nearly all the Latin MSS. from all parts of the world.

Still further; there is internal evidence that it should be in the text; for otherwise there is a rent in it. There is a solecism in the language without it; for the genders do not agree. But if we put in *ὁ Πατήρ καὶ ὁ λόγος* the masculine adjective and participle will have suitable substantives with which to agree; and *τρεῖς οἱ μαρτυροῦντες* will appear to be properly used; and by what the Greeks call attraction the neuter noun following may properly be joined with them.

Indeed, there is need of this verse to express St. John's meaning. For he was summing up the divine and the human testimonies, the witness of God and of man, that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh. He had elsewhere enumerated the heavenly witnesses thus; "I am one that bear witness of myself; and the

Father that sent me beareth witness of me." "And when the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom I will send, even the spirit of truth shall come, he shall testify of me," and, yet, in this epistle where he is summing up the testimony that Jesus is the Son of God, come in the flesh, he passes by the heavenly witnesses to insist upon three earthly witness, if 1 *John* v. 7, 8, be an interpolation.

But this is not all; for this text is in the early Confessions of Faith, and also in the liturgies of both the Greek and Latin churches. Thus the confession of faith of the Greek church says; "God in his nature is true and eternal, and the creator of all things visible and invisible; such also is the Son and the Holy Spirit. They are also of the same essence among themselves: according to the doctrine of John the Evangelist, who says, There are three that bear testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one."

In the liturgy of the Greek church this passage with others is to be read in its course on the thirty-fifth week of the year, as is affirmed in Dr. Smith's *Miscellanea*, p. 155. London, 1686.

It is found also in the *Ordo Romanus* or primitive liturgy of the Latin church; which recites this verse in the offices for Trinity Sunday, and for the octave of Easter, and also in the the office for the administration of baptism; as is affirmed in Travis' *Letters to Gibbon*, pp. 61, 62.

The above two testimonies Dr. Hales considered decisive in favor of the genuineness of the passage. For when we consider the lasting schism that was made between the Greek and Latin churches, we may be assured that the clergy of the Greek church would never have adopted it from the Latins, had it not then been in their Greek text.

Still further; this passage is in the most ancient Latin version which prevailed in Africa, before the Latin Vulgate existed, and it is older than the oldest Greek mss. that have come down to us, and Fulgentius, the learned bishop of Ruspe, in opposing the Arians, thus writes; "In Patre ergo, et filio, et spiritu sancto unitatem substantiæ accipimus, personas confundere non audemus; enim Johannes beatus apostolus testatur; 'Tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent in cælo, Pater, Verbum et Spiritus; et tres unum sunt.'"

We advert to the above sources of evidence to settle the point that this verse was in the text long before the emendations of Eusebius. And how could this be, if it were not in the text from the beginning of Christianity? But on a passage which has occasioned so many volumes to be written by some of the most eminent and learned divines, it is impossible to present the whole argument in one article. On one side we have such men as Bengel, Ernesti, Hales, Nolin, Lawrence, Horsely, Middleton, Burgess and Bloomfield decidedly in its favor; while on the other hand Porson, Marsh, Michaelis and a host of German critics as decisively against it.

But Dr. Bloomfield thinks that "we must wait for additional evidence, before we shall be warranted in rejecting it as indisputably spurious."

It is necessary to advert to the revision of Eusebius, and to the probability that he dropped out of the text the heavenly witness. He was made bishop of Cæsarea A.D., 315. In common with many other bishops he had Arian proclivities. He was intimate with his namesake, the bishop of Nicomedia, who openly espoused the cause of the Arians. And after the Arians were condemned and expelled from their offices, he used his influence with the emperor to have them recalled and reinstated in the church in defiance of Athanasius. He also, A.D. 330, assisted at the council of Antioch where the Arians triumphed. He was present also at the council of Tyre, A.D. 335, and joined the bishops who censured the proceedings of Athanasius, the great champion of orthodoxy. Moreover he used his influence with Constantine to have Athanasius banished.

Is it not evident that he was capable of corrupting the text by leaving out this passage of 1 John v. 7, 8? We know indeed that he did remove other texts from their place, as John viii. 11, the account of the woman taken in adultery, and the closing verses of Mark's gospel. Why, then, may we not think it probable that he did remove the passage in question? Observe what scope Constantine gave him in thus writing him: "It seemeth good unto us to submit to your consideration, that you should order to be written on parchment prepared for the purpose, by able scribes and accurately skilled in the art, fifty codices both legible and portable, so as to be useful, namely, of

the sacred Scriptures, whereof chiefly you know the preparation and use to be necessary to the doctrine of the church."

Thus we see what a large discretion was allowed him of selecting what he knew to be useful and necessary to the doctrine of the church. When we consider the character already given of him, and the fact well known to all that he did drop out other passages; is there not a violent presumption that he let 1 *John* v. 7, 8, drop out from his revision; since we have shown by such abundant evidence that the passage was in the text in the early centuries; and since it is not in those versions or MSS. that have his divisions and sections?

He did not need the power to do it, for he was a great favorite with Constantine. He did not need the will as may appear from his Arian proclivities. He had also the influence of the emperor to recommend his edition to the exclusion of every other. When it is remembered that the number of copies of the New Testament had been greatly reduced under Dioclesian, so much so that there was need of fifty new codices, we can readily perceive that he had every facility to drop out this text of the heavenly witnesses.

And how can it but be that he did it designedly and for a sinister purpose? He had a great reputation for learning; and a person of his intellect could not have left this verse out of fifty codices without knowing what he did.

If such is the light that bishop Bloomfield is waiting for, we hope that his next edition may have it. For we see how this passage became wanting in the earliest Greek MSS. that have come down to us, as none of them are anterior to the fourth century. At the same time we see how it should be found in nearly all the Latin MSS., whether descended from the old Italic version, or the Latin Vulgate, or Jerome's revision. We perceive, too, why it was received by the whole African church, and the Western churches, that were never infected with Arianism: and also why it is not contained in the versions or MSS. that have the sections and divisions of Eusebius.

Let us here quote a passage from Mill's elaborate Greek Testament, written after he had run through all the known MSS. and versions upon this verse; "*Mihi, fateor, (meliora, si quid melius certiusque dederit longior dies, discere parato) argumentis ad*

auctoritatem huic versiculo conciliandam modo adductis roboris inesse videtur, ut eum nullo modo de loco suo movendum esse censeam."

We close the discussion by quoting the whole of bishop Burges' admirable paraphrase of this text :

"This is he that was manifested by his baptism to be the Son of God come in the flesh ; manifested not by his baptism only, with which he commenced his ministry on earth ; but by his death with which he finished it. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness that Jesus is the Son of God. Now the Spirit is truth, a true witness. For he is not alone ; for there are three that bear record in heaven that Jesus is the Son of God ; namely the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit ; and these three are one in the divine nature. And there are three that bear witness in the earth, that the Son of God is come in the flesh ; namely, his last breath on the cross, and the blood and water that issued from his side. And these three are one in the person of Jesus Christ, one united proof of his human nature from the phenomena of his death.

"By the Jewish law the testimony of two or three men is true. If, then, we receive the witness of men as true, the witness of God is greater ; for this is the witness of God that he hath testified of his Son."

[A peculiar interest attaches to this discussion. As a field of historical criticism, it has been open from a very early day, and seems closed from time to time only to be re-opened by succeeding scholars. The affirmations and denials are yet so positive and so scholarly on the genuineness of these passages that evidently the time has not come to close the case.

The quotations following, with which we supplement this Article, will show the discussion in its more recent phases, as presented by some of the ablest Greek editors of the New Testament.

ACTS XX. 28. Alford on this disputed reading says :

"The question between Θεοῦ and κυρίου rests principally on internal evidence, which of the two is likely to have been the original reading. The MS. authority, now that it is certain that B has Θεοῦ *a prima manu* is weighty on both sides. The early patristic authority for the expr. αἰμα Θεοῦ is considerable." "If κυρίου was the original, it is very possible (1) that some busy scribe may have written

at the side, as so often occurs, Θεοῦ. . . . Or (2) that the expression ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ κυρίου, not found any where else, may have been corrected into the very usual one ἐκκλ. (τοῦ) Θεοῦ, which occurs eleven times in the Epp. of Paul. . . . Or (3) which I consider exceedingly improbable, the alteration may have been made solely in the interest of orthodoxy. . . . On the other hand, if Θεοῦ was the original, but one reason can be given why it should have been altered to κυρίου, and that one was sure to have operated. It would stand as a bulwark against Arianism, an assertion which no skill could evade, which must therefore be modified. If Θεοῦ stood in the text originally it was sure to be altered to κυρίου. . . . Pauline usage must be allowed its fair weight in the inquiry." If κυρίου be the reading it is "an expression which no where else occurs in his writings, nor indeed in those of his contemporaries. . . . On the whole then, weighing the evidence on both sides . . . I have on a final revision of this volume, decided for the received reading, which in first writing it I had rejected. And this decision has been confirmed in preparing this fourth edition. March, 1860."—Alford's Greek Testament *in loco*.

"The whole question must lie between τοῦ κυρίου and τοῦ Θεοῦ, for the reading that combines both fails as to ancient MS. authority . . . as to versions, and as to each citation." Τοῦ Θεοῦ has good witnesses in B (the other MSS. are unimportant) and the Vulgate; but τοῦ κυρίου has preponderating testimony; for B alone could not on such a point outweigh A C D E, and as to versions and fathers, τοῦ κυρίου stands on stronger ground; and therefore it should be accepted, even while all that can be said in favor of τοῦ Θεοῦ is fully admitted."—Tregelles on the Printed Text, p. 233.

The conclusions of Dr. Tregelles were published in 1854. Tischendorf reads τοῦ κυρίου.

The principal names on either side, beside those mentioned are, for Θεοῦ, Mill, Wolf, Bengel, Matthæi and Scholz: for κυρίου Grotius, Le Clerc, Wetstein, Griesbach, Kuinoel, De Wette, Meyer and Lachmann.

1 TIM. III. 16. On the disputed reading in this verse Alford concludes positively that it should be ἐς and not Θεός. He bases his conclusion on the MS. evidences.

"Now that it may be fairly said, that merely external considerations have settled this question, we are not driven to combine internal considerations." "The testimonies of the fathers for Θεός are

very doubtful." "How completely the whole glorious sentence is marred and disjoined by the substitution of *Θεός*." "There is hardly a passage in the New Testament in which I feel more deep personal thankfulness for the restoration of the true and wonderful connection of the original text."

On the reading of *Θεός* instead of the relative *ὃς* or *ὅς*, Tregelles says that the former

"Is upheld by no version whatever, prior to the Arabic of the Polyglot and the Slavonic, both of which are more recent than the seventh century, and possess no value as critical witnesses." "The versions which support a relative are, 1. The Old Latin. 2. The Vulgate. 3. Peshito. 4. Hareclean Syriac. 5. Mephitic. 6. Thebaic. 7. Gothic. 8. Armenian. 9. Æthiopic. That is, all the versions older than the seventh century."—Printed Text, pp. 227, 8.

In this passage Tischendorf reads *ὃς*.

1 JOHN v. 7, 8. On retaining or rejecting the disputed reading in this passage Alford remarks :

"Omitted in all Greek mss. previous to the beginning of the sixteenth century ; all the Greek fathers, even when producing texts in support of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity ; . . . all the ancient versions including the Vulgate, as it came from Jerome, and, though interpolated in the modern editions, the Syriac ; and many Latin fathers." "The Vulgate is cited in support of the disputed passage. It is true that it is found in the mass of the later mss. of that version, but it is wanting in the two earliest, (written in the sixth century,) in those revised by Alcuin and in about fifty others ; whilst those that contain it differ both as to the words themselves and as to their positions."

"The question of the genuineness of the words read in the rec. at the end of verse 7, has been discussed, as far as external grounds are concerned in the digest ; and it has been seen, that unless pure caprice is to be followed in the criticism of the sacred text, there is not the shadow of a reason for supposing them genuine. Even the supposed citations of them in early Latin fathers have now, on closer examination, disappeared. Something remains to be said on internal grounds, on which we have full right to enter, now that the other is secured. And on these grounds it must appear, on any fair and unprejudiced consideration, that the words are (1) alien from the context ; (2) in themselves incoherent, and betraying another hand than the Apostle's."

"The Greek words were first inserted in the Complutensian edition of 1514. When Erasmus enquired whether the editors really had mss. so different from any he had seen, the answer given by one of them was: 'Sciendum est Græcorum codices esse corruptos; nostros vero [i. e. Latinos] ipsam veritatem continere.' Erasmus unfortunately pledged himself to insert the words if they existed in any one Greek ms. A Codex Britannicus was at length found which contained them, and Erasmus in his 3d edition (1522) fulfilled his promise."—Alford's *Tes. in loco*.

Tregelles says :

"To enter into a formal discussion of the genuineness of the 'testimony of the heavenly witnesses,' 1 John v. 7, 8, is really superfluous; for it would only be doing over again what has been done so repeatedly that there cannot be two opinions in the minds of those who now know the evidence, and are capable of appreciating its force."—p. 226.

This is quite declaratory and aims to be conclusive. Tischendorf omits the doubtful passage.—EDITORS.]

ARTICLE IV.

CLARK'S ILLUSTRATIONS OF EGYPT.

Daleth, or the Homestead of the Nations: Egypt Illustrated. By EDWARD L. CLARK. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1864.

A CONTEMPORARY critic aptly remarks that "the Arab with bowed head and ear pressed to the lips of the Sphinx, in the picture by Vedder, which has lately attracted so much attention in our exhibitions, represents not inaptly the manner in which the European world has listened for centuries to every new thing that could be learned of that land of mystery where the Sphinx is at home." We must add, to perfect the allusion, that the everlasting silence, which seals the lips of this stony symbol, is the striking emblem, and is likely long to be, of the fruitless questioning of the memorials of that land of wonder, to reveal the secrets of much of its ancient power and renown. We can as little find out the clue to its peculiar achievements in art and

industry, as we can imitate those colossal works which survive to pique our inquisitiveness and to challenge our rivalry.

The author of this elegant and tempting volume is a young clergyman, the pastor of one of our rural parishes, who travelled extensively in the East, four years ago. This, we think, is his first literary adventure; and he has thrown into it the freshness and vigor of a mind finely cultivated in polite letters, and of an imagination alive to the strikingly arresting facts and features of the Oriental world. He has possessed himself generally of the literature and the leading discoveries of Egyptological science; and has combined them, with the relation of his own personal observations, into a gracefully written book, into which he has gathered a choice collection of illustrative drawings, colored and plain, of the ruins and wonders of that strange land, as well as of the manners and customs, the localities and universal characteristics, of the Egypt of to-day.

We may as well, at the outset, despatch one or two exceptions to this work, which do not materially detract from its value as a popular account of Egypt, while we can not, in justice, let them pass unnoticed. A more simple style would, we think, have better expressed the idea in some sections where the author's pen has glided into a vein of what savors too much of the romancist, for a narrative of this description. This tendency of his mind has probably betrayed him into another fault — a want of sufficient accuracy in the prosaic matters of dates, and the estimates of distances, heights, and the like troublesome minutiae which give the reviewers so nice an opportunity to trip incautious wayfarers. Most of these lapses occur in connection with antiquarian topics. They are blemishes upon the fair face of the work, yet do not amount to any very serious affair. Perfect accuracy is, of course, to be ever sought by all practicable painstaking; but it is oftener sought than secured. In our judgment there is too much of real merit in this book to subject it to a wholesale condemnation for these imperfections.

Daleth, which we can hardly sever from the Greek Delta, in its triangular outline, as the early writing shaped it, was cut deeply into the face of the Egyptian temples by their mysterious builders, as the same figure stands forever challenging the curiosity of the ages in the tapering Pyramids. The letter thus

bears a kind of typical sense as pertaining to this primitive "homestead of the nations." The configuration of the coast lands, where the great river of Egypt empties itself into the sea, takes the same form, making what the geographers have long known as the Delta of the Nile. Daleth is a door; and this is the doorway by which our traveller takes us into the land of the Pharaohs, reaching the port of Alexandria on the fifth day from Malta.

Our interest is at once enlisted in the volume by the rapid but very suggestive bird's-eye view, which it takes in the opening chapter, of the ancient civilization of this kingdom. It requires, as it deserves, a frequent reiteration to make us believe, and even then we can scarcely realize it, that along the Nile, six centuries before our Christian era, the science of astronomy had unveiled many of our present modes of explaining the phenomena and motions of the heavenly bodies; that chemistry had taught the secrets of its combinations; that its students were proficient in the working and tempering of metals, having mastered the most delicate processes of metallurgy.

"The steel, whose blue edge the accurate painters of the Egyptian tombs have preserved, is more than three thousand years old. How did they temper copper with tin? How mould and use the metals? How work the mines of Nubia and Sinai and the Red Sea, which extend far under the water? We wander amid these mines to-day, and behold the remains of the poor workmen, where the shafts have broken or the excavations fallen, with a new idea of the greatness of that power which offered hecatombs of lives in the building of altars to which the nation was a great sacrifice. Or how is it possible that the hardest granite and softest sandstone were alike engraved and polished with a skill far surpassing the workmanship of the finest chisels in France? The obelisk which stands in solitary state in the Place de la Concorde at Paris turned the edge of the best steel, and the date of its erection could scarcely be put upon its pedestal, yet it was crowded with hieroglyphics. Upon many of the monuments of Egypt the letters are three inches deep, and the closest observation discloses only the perfectness of the work. The most delicate lines covering hundreds of square feet of the finest polished stone set at defiance all modern art. We learn that they gave bronze blades the elasticity of steel, and, without hardening it, made copper cut stone. Basalt was a plaything to them, and por-

phyry yielded, like marble, to the delicate yet strong touch of these masters."—pp. 6, 7.

The mechanical instruments by which those ancient quarriers and architects lifted and placed almost incredible masses of rock, are a hardly explained riddle to our philosophers. Equal was their skill in the embellishments of domestic and civic life. They were proficient in music, were adepts in colors, cut gems and finger-rings with more than Parisian or Florentine exquisiteness.

"Fragments of Egyptian glass have survived the rust and ruin of four thousand years. We may still see it stamped with the undisputed name of the Pharaoh who reigned in the eighteenth dynasty, while in the tombs of far earlier date the process of its manufacture is represented on the walls. Plate glass, and ground glass, interwoven with delicate gold threads and bright colors which struck through the vases without spreading or fading, delicate birds with the natural tints of their plumage, graceful animals, imitations of precious stones and beads, vases and cups with figures of the gods in brilliant garments, lines of blue and red and yellow wrought in curves or straight figures on green and white ground, are all preserved for our admiration. It is evident, also, that every part of the glass ware, however delicate, was made separately, and nicely joined together. And beside these, gold figures, with ornamented wings, were set in cups of malleable glass, which Pliny says could be thrown violently on stone without breaking."—pp. 10, 11.

In tinting these retrospective pictures with a somewhat overcharged color, (as is quite possible,) we do not regard our traveller as at all falsifying history, or implying that the condition of the nation which undeniably wrought such marvels was politically or socially desirable. The Egyptians were slaves, their labor was forced and unrequited, there was no general security or happiness. The only favored classes were the nobles and priests. Property was the monopoly of the few. Egypt was no land of delight. Our author does not so represent it. He tells us what was done there, and this will ever be the world's wonder. It did not fall into his design to tell us at length how abjectly miserable that priest-ridden, king-ridden people were. We do not quarrel with him for not shading his canvass more deeply with the wretchedness of the subjects of that old-world oppression.

Very much of the impression of travel, in those lands which sepulchre the primeval civilizations, lies in the power of the tourist to restore, in imagination, the buried grandeurs of the past, and then to transfer the picture from his own mind to that of his reader. It is a rare faculty, essentially of the poetic, that is, the creative kind. Mr. Clark possesses it to a marked degree. His chapter on Alexandria illustrates it. This once famous city is now a dingy, squalid town, straggling along the shore, infested with the usual mongrel populace of an eastern mart, noisy with donkeys and their mulish drivers, with barking, flea-bitten dogs, and vociferous women. What few relics of the olden times survive are so mixed up with the present coarseness and vulgarity of a wretched race, that it demands a persistent effort to feel the slightest enthusiasm where one expected to be rapt away in glorious ecstasies of sentiment. We well remember how our incipient enthusiasm was dashed with amusing vexation, as on the steps of the Athenian Acropolis, where Plato walked and Aristotle talked, all our romantic sensations were incontinently paralyzed by the hideous braying of one of those omnipresent donkeys which his owner was cudgelling, at the moment, just down by the grand old walls of the Dionysiac amphitheatre. So the sublime is ever dogged by the ridiculous. Our author, however, has the art of gliding out of all this contemporaneous squalidness and sansculotism with charming ease, and replacing it with those bygone splendors, as by a stroke of the magician's wand. Thus here in Alexandria. It is no longer the ragged modern seaport which he sees. "In those days, another Alexandria lay spread out like a map beneath this column. It is this city we would visit." And so it rises with its fifteen miles' extent of walls, the metropolis of Roman viceroys, the home of fabulous luxury and magnificence, where princely bishops ruled, and Cæsarean proconsuls flaunted their almost imperial wealth and power, while commerce filled the spacious haven with bristling masts, and philosophers and priests and men and women of every clime jostled each other in streets and hippodrome; where, too, the fair Hypatia is one day brutally killed by a fierce mob of fanatics. But we can not follow the spectacle farther. It is a radiant picture of a life to which distance doubtless lends no little power. And

so are many others which enliven these pages, as the meditative traveller sets down the impression of what he sees around him, and of what he sees coming up from the storied ages gone by.

We think that Mr. Clark has done wisely in not attempting to solve the hard questions in Egyptology which even the experts in that lore are not well agreed about. His pages are tastefully free from foot notes and learned references which are often the cheap counterfeits of careful inquiry; still, we can scarcely dispense with references to authorities in books which involve intricate and contested inquiries. He shows his acquaintance with his theme historically, in giving us the knowledge which he has melted over in his own crucible, and run again into his own moulds. But the bulk of the book is made up of materials from his personal notes of touring. These contain a large amount of valuable information respecting the country and people as now existing. Our limits preclude quotation or condensation of these descriptions to any considerable extent. In fact, it is not necessary, as Egypt is now one of the most travelled countries, and consequently one of the best known to the western nations. But we must draw from these pages one or two pictures of present life, as our tourist touches them deftly with his elastic pencil. Of course we select them from the Pyramids and the Nile—the two grand centres of inspiration in modern Egyptian travel-writing, though those old cyclopean temples have attractions of their own scarcely, if at all, of secondary interest. But for these we must refer to our author's vivid sketches.

The party is at the foot of the great stone triangle of Ghizeh. They have hurried along through palm groves, and grain breast high, and the hot sands, and at first are as much disappointed with the stupendous pile of granite which has brought them thither, as most people are with the first look at Niagara. But this is only for a moment. A swarm of half naked Arabs are ready to help them heavenward.

“ ‘Master us!’ says the ghost of the Pyramid. So we leap easily upon the first layer of stone. It is only three feet high. A second is gained. A third is overcome. A fourth is almost too much. A fifth suggests a delay. Let the Arabs pull on either side, or push behind, not a step will we go till we are rested. ‘Master us!’ says

the ghost of the Pyramid. It rises and towers above us as if the sky rested upon its summit. The mass of stone seems to crush the hills. Had the giants here piled Ossa on Pelion? The old Latin reader is our guide-book, and mythology our best history. Only two hundred layers of stone remain! Away we start, and at length gain the summit, which is scarcely thirty-two feet square, and is covered with names written with weary hands. We have mastered the Pyramid without the strength to record our triumph."—pp. 60, 61.

The panorama which this apex of vision commands is described with graphic power, and so is also the coming down from this perilous elevation.

"The view from this triumph of ambition reminds us of its name, Pi Rama, 'the mountain.' We are lifted so far above the Arabs, that they seem to creep like insects about the hills, and the caravans, as they steal along the level plain of the western horizon, are the fine lines of a dream. On the south reaches the grand procession of Pyramids, sixty-seven in number; some of brick and some of stone, some broken and some perfect. They seem like sentinels, protecting the green line of river foliage from the desert. The Nile rolls its floods through the valley, attended by the fields of barley and blossoming lupines. Here and there a flock of sheep are seen coming to their rude folds; or a train of camels stalking over the dikes leads the eye to dark villages or slender palm-groves. The broken Saracenic bridges, the graceful sails on the river as far as the eye can see, beyond the last of the Pyramids, the beautiful meshes of the silver canals, and, more than all, the distant city of Cairo, with its minarets and mosques and palaces glistening in the sun, unfold a scene unlike any beside. The Abana pours a torrent of splendor upon the plains of Damascus, and sweeps in eddies about its gates, its waves of verdure throwing the fruit blossoms like foam against its walls. But the dashing Abana has not the dignity and power of the lordly Nile. The view of the 'Golden Horn' and the Bosphorus, as it mirrors the palaces and mosques of Constantinople, is wonderful. But it has not, as a strange and mysterious background, the desert — lifeless, sad, yet ever struggling, like death, to destroy the life and glory which it can not give back again. There is no view like that of the Pyramids! They are mountains in history, lifting themselves out of the desert of the past which has covered the traces of their builders. They are landmarks to the traveller seeking for the origin of his race, towering above the ruin of ages, the first milestones in the advance of civilization. From their summit we look upon the Cairo of to-day, which came to them for the

foundations of its mosques; the Memphis of yesterday, as it is builded in their shadow; and a long succession of cities cherishing the arts, and glorying in the patience which had lifted its stones when as yet not a chisel had vexed the mountains of other lands.

"We are rapidly rebuilding Memphis when the Arabs interrupt us with impatient clamors. One long look, and we are ready to descend. But it is often more difficult to get down than to climb up. Pius IX. finds it so, and why should not we? Horace evidently forgot St. Peter's and the Pyramids, when he said, 'the way down is easy.' What hanging in mid-air from the arms of strangers! What trembling knees, and weary hands, and tired limbs indignant at each shock! What timid glances downward, and gentle force urging on, before a remonstrance can be uttered, to accomplish the movement! To be sure, the Arabs declare that we are the strongest, handsomest, richest, and most generous possessors of 'buck-sheesh' that ever came down a Pyramid; but they reject a blessing which has no gleam of silver to prove it, and leave us at length, tired and alone, leaning upon the stones, and dreaming, like Jacob, of stairways to heaven, upon which, not angels, but our own weary selves are continually ascending and descending."—pp. 62—64.

Nile-boating is the very *dolce far niente* of dreamy, poetic, elysian locomotion. From the lumbering Italian diligence, or the rushing, dusty flight of a railway carriage, to the slowly drifting, gently wafted floating of the Nile boat, with the drowsy natives dozing, sleeping, singing, praying as the mood takes them, while the ripple of the stream plays with your keel a lulling dalliance, and here and there a low village along the banks tells you that you are not navigating a river beyond the confines of an inhabited globe—the contrast is complete! It is worth a Mediterranean voyage to a New Englander to experience so thoroughly new a sensation.

You drive the boat peg into the soft bank, and ramble out along the fields and through the hamlets, admiring the brilliantly dyed birds, the ghostly camels of the early twilight, the domestic fowls, the uncouth natives, and all the strange, weird oddities of so primitive a state of existence. The breeze freshens, and again casting off, you sweep out into the turbid stream musing about the days before the flood or any thing which is farthest removed from the wear and tear of our modern friction. There is none of this here. The years of Methusaleh have come back again. There is time enough to live without hurry-

ing forevermore. The nervousness is all gone from your bones. A day is nearer like a thousand years than you ever thought of so utterly realizing. An old crocodile rounds up his back as if to destroy in you the last traces of a sense of personal identity. Your Occidental home and antecedents become to you a dancing, nebulous phantasmagoria. Father Nile has metamorphosed you into another son of the desert, whose yellow sands shimmer under the sunlight like a becalmed ocean of molten metal.

"The evenings on the Nile are the dream of a lifetime. Then the bold hunter Orion comes slowly up from the Arabian desert, and the constellation of Canopus rises over the southern hills, shining through the dry air, clear and beautiful as the lamps in the temples of olden time. The tall Shadoofs seem stalking through the dull haze along the horizon. Every hillside, with that sympathy peculiar to the limestone ranges of Egypt, changes from the ruddy sunset to the silver hue of night. You almost hear the faint, far-off music of the palaces, and leave behind you, like the foam of the river, the two thousand years of Egypt's misery. She is only asleep. Silver pathways rise in the moonlight for the white feet of the Naiads, and wait gleaming and quivering for their coming. The morrow will unfold the blossoms of the Padma, the wild lotus,

'which whoso tastes

Insatiate riots in the sweet repast!

Nor other home, nor other care intends,

But quits his home, his country, and his friends.'"

"How majestic is the Nile! Like the streams of Eden, it seems created, not gathered. Calm and changeless, yet ever beautiful as the shadow of its own hills, it reflects the deep blue of a cloudless sky and the firmness of a constant sun.

'It flows through old hushed Egypt and its sands,

Like some grave, mighty thought threading a dream.'

When the land droops under the gathering splendor of the year, its supplies are ready and exhaustless. Want never comes here, though she passes through all other lands. You may well believe that there is somewhere a struggle of childhood, weeping chasms, and deep pools, and noisy brooks. The determined voice at Syene, the gentle yet firm struggle at Silsilis, remind us of this. But the Nile alone has no history for inquisitive man. We know that a single stream, far above El Makyar, united with its currents, and gave the influence of power to the charm of beauty; but henceforth they two are alone. El Tayr, with her cliffs, frowns in vain. The plains of Thebes attempt her delay with unavailing praise. The Nile moves gently

onward. The Arabs say, 'Those who float there ever praise Allah, whose smile it reflects, and must come again, for it is thoughtful in greatness and sublime in calmness.' And what stream was ever so devotedly loved as this! When it declines to meet the great sea, its last fields are richest and its last skies are clearest. Still smiling the Nile passes away, like Ceres, beholding the grain and flowers which were just scattered springing up upon every side. Without struggle or sadness, the river of Egypt is still loved, still worthy of the saying of its people, that 'with her the passions sleep and the heart wakes forever.'—pp. 109, 113.

Our readers, we are quite sure, will not be content with our scant reviewal of this inviting work, but will hasten to make up for our enforced deficiency in its survey by giving themselves the pleasure of a leisurely perusal of the original. We have hardly touched upon its contents. Chapters with such suggestive headings as Heliopolis, Thebes, Luxor, Edfoo, Philæ, Cairo, The Desert, we have passed in entire silence. Its eighty pictorial designs, some of them of exceeding beauty, we have no power to reproduce. A thoughtful spirit suffuses these records of the past and present with a moral attractiveness, that must greatly enhance the entertainment which they will afford, to contemplative minds.

ARTICLE V.

THE SERPENT IN EDEN AND THE FALL.

WE offer a contribution to this primitive subject, in a brief discussion of three points: the Temptation; the Tempter; and the Consequences of the transgression.

The Temptation, what was it? In what did it consist? In the second chapter of Genesis, 9th, 16th and 17th verses, we read as follows: "And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food: the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil." . . . "And the Lord God commanded the man saying: Of every tree of the garden thou mayst freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and

evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The temptation then of Eden consisted in the inducements held out to taste of the fruit of a certain tree, called the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil."

But an enlarged answer is demanded by the additional inquiry; why was this tree so called? We shall here present as succinctly as possible several opinions of the learned which mostly agree. Poole in his Annotations says:

"It was so called with respect either (1) To God, who thereby would prove and make known man's good or evil, his obedience and happiness, or his rebellion and misery; or rather, (2) To man who by the use of it would know to his cost how great and good things he did enjoy, and might have kept by his obedience, and how evil and bitter the fruits of his disobedience were to himself and all his posterity."

Yet others say that it was so named in respect to Adam and Eve, who, by tasting it against the revealed will of God, should learn to know by woful experience a vast difference between the good of obedience and the evil of disobedience. Says Ainsworth in his commentary on Genesis, "It was so named because God's law which forbade man to eat of this tree should teach what is good and evil; be a rule of obedience, showing man's goodness and righteousness if he did obey, or his evil if he did transgress." Milton, in his "Christian Doctrine," has the following passages:

"It was necessary that something should be forbidden or commanded as a test of fidelity, and that an act in its own nature indifferent, in order that man's obedience might be thereby manifested." "It was called the tree of knowledge of good and evil from the event; for since Adam tasted it we not only know evil, but we know good only by means of evil."

In his "Paradise Lost" (iv. 426, 7) he says:

"God hath pronounced it death to taste that tree,
The only sign of our obedience left."

It will be perceived that the opinions quoted in the main coincide. More recent commentators might be cited to the same purport. All agree that the tree was a test tree; but whether a test by which God might know or prove whether man

would be good or evil ; or a test by which man would know, by experience, good and evil, there is some disagreement. Before however stating any opinion, we wish to bring forward one more authority, an authority of more ancient date, and which has the sanction of our Saviour and the apostles, inasmuch as it was constantly used by them, the Septuagint. In this translation we read that the tree of knowledge was a tree by which to know what may be known of good and evil" : τὸ ξύλον τοῦ εἰδέναι γνῶστέον καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ. In the same chapter we also read ; "But of the tree by which to know good and evil" : ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν. According to Ainsworth, the Chaldee and the Jerusalem Targums read thus : "the tree of whose fruit they that eat shall know the difference between good and evil." In these authorities the opinion that the tree of knowledge was a tree by which man was to know good and evil is evidently set forth. This opinion we are inclined to think the correct one. The acute Vitringa, however, stoutly combats it. Let us appeal to the record.

First, then, the language made use of by the serpent in the fifth verse, "For God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods (or God, as the Chaldee has it, according to Dr. A. Clarke) knowing good and evil," was very probably used in the sense in which it was understood by Eve. The very next verse seems to intimate this. "She saw that it was a tree to make one wise;" and hence the great strength of the temptation. In the eleventh verse this is also plainly intimated : "Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?" Again in the twenty-second verse this seems also to be intimated. "And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us to know good and evil." There is, however, some dispute in regard to this last passage. Poole considers it as irony, and compares it with 1 Kings xviii. 27 and Eccl. xi. 9. Prof. Bush on the other hand adduces it as a proof in point.

We think it plain that the tree of knowledge was placed in the midst of the garden as a test-tree, from which if our first parents had abstained, they never would have known evil, neither good as contrasted with it, and thus filling them with

regret on account of it; but which bitter knowledge they obtained by yielding to those desires, which, in order to constitute the tree anything of a test, it was necessary to implant within them. This does not make God a tempter. God tempteth no man. The sin of Eve did not consist in desiring to partake of the fruit of the tree, in itself considered, but in desiring to partake of the fruit of a tree on which rested the interdict of God, than which interdict we can have no greater proof against the idea of God's acting the part of a tempter in the transaction of the Fall. The language of God is, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" but the language of the tempter is, "Thou shalt not surely die."

We turn now to a consideration of the tempter himself. What is the nature of the history here given of him? Is it a mere fable, with a moral meaning, as Middleton contends? Is the devil in that history called a serpent figuratively, because in tempting Eve he used the qualities natural to serpents? Or is he so called because he entered into a serpent, cunningly and maliciously taking advantage of certain circumstances for the purpose of accomplishing his designs?

We shall consider only the last of these propositions, in doing which the two former will naturally be disposed of. The principal objection which meets us is the fact of the serpent's talking. This reptile has not the requisite organs for articulation, and it is urged that it is too much to suppose that the devil had power to create them. To obviate this difficulty the fact is adduced that Balaam's ass is said to have spoken. But the cases are far from being parallel. The Lord caused Balaam's ass to speak and not the devil.

Adam Clarke attempts to remove these objections, but in a most singular manner. He annihilates the serpent, and with wonderful facility creates a new order of beings. Animals, similar in appearance to apes, figure upon his page, endowed with reason, and gifted with an articulation, artful and persuasive. At the same time he tramples under foot the authority of the Septuagint.

It is strange, says this commentator, that in the Arabic are found words very similar to אָפֶּן in the Hebrew, two of which, derived from the same root, respectively signify ape and devil.

Upon this circumstance he builds his argument, to the substance of which we have alluded; but we think it without the countenance of reason, and contrary to the Scriptures, in every instance containing any allusion, either direct or indirect, to the circumstance of the Fall. The fact of the serpent's speaking requires no such shifting as this. The serpent spoke through the agency of the devil, which we do not consider an unaccountable fact, or at least no more so than that the devil should have the power to inflict upon Job sore boils. Here, in this last instance, was an act of power, not similar to be sure, but yet a degree of power fully as wonderful, and which we are confident the devil did possess. We say nothing how the devil came by this power. We only bring this forward to meet the objection that the devil could not have caused the serpent to speak, or rather could not have spoken through an animal unpossessed of the power of articulation.

It will be inferred from the foregoing, that we are of the opinion that a real serpent was concerned in the transaction of the Fall; and that the circumstance of his talking ought to be made a matter of faith and not of speculation. That the serpent was different in some respects from what we now behold it, we cannot doubt. The history would lead us to infer that its mode of living and locomotion was different; but that it was essentially the same in appearance, we do not hesitate to believe; especially if the sense of the ancients as found both in the Bible and in the heathen mythologies, which mythologies must have a higher authority than any merely heathen, is of the least account.

Able arguments have been founded on the sense of the ancients, as found in the Old and New Testaments, by bishop Sherlock and Dr. Hill. Faber in "*Horæ Mosaicæ*" collects the same sense as found among the heathen mythologies. We have not space to enter into an extensive consideration of the conclusive arguments as maintained by these able writers; but we cannot pass over this subject without some notice of the manner in which they endeavor to maintain their position.

Bishop Sherlock, who confines himself to the Old Testament, adduces several delicate allusions to the Fall, from the book of Job, a book which is supposed by many to have been written

before the Pentateuch. In chap. xxvi, v. 13th, we read, "His hand hath formed the crooked serpent." In the translation of the Seventy we have undeniable evidence of the ancient traditional explication of this passage. The translation is, "By a decree he destroyed the apostate dragon," *προστάγματι δι' ἰθανάτῳσε δράκοντα ἀποστάτην*. The Syraic and Arabic versions, adds Sherlock, are to the same sense. Numerous other passages, and from other books, are dwelt upon by this writer which we have not time to notice.

Dr. Hill begins where bishop Sherlock leaves off, and dwells upon the sense of the ancients as found in the New Testament. The two arguments form a complete whole and ought to go together. The passage in the book of Revelation, "The dragon, that old serpent, the devil," is very forcibly alluded to by Dr. Hill, as also many other passages.

Faber in his "*Horræ Mosaicæ*" has collected, so that they may be seen at a glance, the ancient heathen mythologies relating to this subject. We have not room to quote from Faber; but what, we ask, mean the stories of the Dracontian Ahriman of the Persians; the malignant serpent Caliga of Hindu theology; the serpent Typhon of the Egyptians; the serpent Python of the Greeks; the evil serpent Ophioneus, whose treason is so well remembered among the inhabitants of Syria; together with the Gothic and Scythian mythologies, and the Loki of the ancient Scalds? Loki, the last one mentioned, is styled, "the father of the great serpent; the father of death; the adversary; the accuser; the deceiver of the gods." *

We may bring forward other instances drawn from various sources. In India the destroying power, or death, is signified by the serpent. In classic antiquity the giants who attempted to scale heaven are figured as half serpents. The story of the Hesperides is a remarkable one. There were three nymphs, daughters of Hesperus. Their residence was in a beautiful garden, abounding with delicious fruit, which was guarded by a dragon that never slept. The celebrated golden apples grew in this garden, and it was one of the labors of Hercules to procure them. Hercules is sometimes represented as gathering the apples, and the dragon which guarded the tree appears bowing

* Keyser's Religion of the Northmen

his head, as having received a mortal wound. After death, Hercules, who when a mere child had strangled two serpents who were sent to destroy him, was ranked among the gods and received divine honors. Oïsel on ancient coins and medals has a plate representing a serpent near a green tree, an evident and striking allusion to the serpent seducing Eve. In a cabalistic book, quoted by Vitranga, called *Tikun Sophar*, it is written, "He said to them, that serpent with which ye contend, that ye may escape from him, is the same who hath slain and devoured others, and not only the first man but all generations."

Can there be any doubt whether there was a real serpent concerned in the transaction of the Fall? How is it that all these stories, covered though they be with the accumulations of unenlightened ages, yet approach so near the biblical account of the circumstances of the Fall, as would lead even the most unphilosophical and uninformed to refer them back to the same common origin. The same common origin they must have had. They can only be looked upon as traditions which early assumed a sensible form, and hence have come down to us, so many palpable proofs of the truth of the Mosaic account. They are impressive proofs. It seems as if providence had determined that we should be left in no doubt upon this point, when entering an ancient heathen pagoda, the first objects which present themselves are two figures venerated as gods; the one encircled within the folds of a serpent which is biting his heel; and the other, a mediatorial god, represented in the act of trampling upon its crushed head. There can be no mistake in regard to this matter. Similar representations were found in the temples of the ancient Mexicans. In Cashmere also there were anciently no less than seven hundred places where serpents were worshipped. In Salsette and Elephanta almost all the deities either grasped a serpent in their hands, or were figured as environed by them.

Enough has been said with regard to the sense of the ancients respecting the kind of animal concerned in bringing about the Fall, and to show that this sense agrees most strikingly with the Mosaic account.

We notice one objection to the position taken that a real serpent was concerned in this transaction. We have already no-

ticed sufficiently the objection that the serpent had not the organs requisite for articulation. But it is furthermore urged, that if the serpent had not the power of speech, Eve would have been afraid, or, at least, have expressed some surprise: hence it is concluded that the *נחש* must have been some animal other than a serpent, and gifted with speech. The latter part of this objection appears to run into the one first considered: we allude only to that portion of it which respects the supposed necessary fear or surprise of Eve. The common manner of removing this difficulty, namely, that Eve was innocent and could therefore have no fear, does not appear sufficient. Eve, being innocent, might not have known fear, but we cannot suppose her destitute of surprise, a principle which enters so largely into that wonder and admiration, without which we cannot for a moment believe a being situated like Eve to have been.

But there is a way of meeting this objection found in some of the older writers. An ingenious author, mentioned by Poole, writes thus:

“The serpent makes his address to the woman with a short speech. She was not frightened because as yet there was no cause for fear, no sin, and therefore no danger; but she wonders and enquires what is meant, and whether he was not a brute creature, and how he came to have speech and understanding? The serpent replies, that he was no better than a brute, and did indeed want both these gifts, but by eating of a certain fruit in the garden he got both. She asked what fruit and tree that was? When he showed her, she replied, ‘This is no doubt an excellent fruit, &c., but God hath forbidden it.’ To which the serpent replied as in the text.”

It is true, says Poole, this is not found in the record left by Moses, but it is confessed by Jewish and other expositors that these words, “Yea hath God said,” form a short, abrupt sentence, and were but the close of something foregoing. So in a work by Storr and Flatt we find the following quotation from the Com: *De Protevangelio*:

“The natural serpent ate of the forbidden fruit, and Eve observed it. The devil accordingly took occasion to connect with this circumstance a conversation with Eve, in order to induce her to transgress the command of God. Eve believed that it was the natural serpent that spake to her, and supposed that the eating of the fruit had con-

ferred on the serpent the power of rational conversation, which she had not hitherto observed in any of the animals around her, not even in the serpent itself whom she had known before."

That something of the kind, as set forth in the above quotations, did take place previous to the abrupt conversation recorded by Moses is not at all impossible. It may have taken place, and therefore did, for aught we know; and hence may serve to silence any one who may advance the objection under consideration. It is not improbable, however, that such a circumstance and conversation, as supposed by these writers did actually occur. The abrupt manner in which the Mosaic account commences has already been alluded to; but, if we notice the sixth verse, the probability becomes still stronger. "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat." It seems as if there must have been something more than the conversation in the previous verses to have induced Eve to form the conclusion that the tree "was good for food." How could she know the tree was good for food, unless she had seen the serpent eat of its fruit? We need not dwell upon this portion of our subject.

No sooner had Eve partaken of the fruit of the tree, and her husband with her, than the eyes of both were opened, and they knew that they were naked, and girded themselves about with fig leaves. A terrible light broke in upon their minds and consciences. They saw at once the arts by which the devil had blinded their eyes, and an overpowering sense of the magnitude of their sin came in upon them, like a flood. They felt how great was the cost of that knowledge which they had obtained by violating the commands of their Creator. They found themselves exposed to the infliction of all the terrors of the curse. Their souls were naked; there was nothing between them and the just vengeance of an offended God. They were guilty; there was no excuse. That which before was their glory, now became a source of shame; they could not tell why. They do not seem to have been aware that this was one of the fruits of disobedience. Perhaps they ought always to have covered themselves; hence the miserable apology of Adam to the Lord:

"I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked : and I hid myself." It was the conscience of Adam that smote him.

The real cause of Adam's hiding himself was not his bodily nakedness. The great cause lay back of that, a deep, crushing sense of guilt, an utter nakedness of soul. His outward condition was but the index of something deeper and truer within, and was presented, whether or not Adam knew the true cause of his shame, as an apology for his hiding himself because "he was afraid."

It cannot with any consistency be here urged, because we contend for a spiritual nakedness, that therefore the fig leaves which were sewed together must have been spiritual also. We do not contend for spiritual nakedness alone. Adam knew his bodily condition, but because he knew it, must it therefore follow that he could not have had a sense of guilt, and hence, if not from it as a sole motive, at least from it as an added motive, have hid himself? How came Adam to have a sense of his bodily nakedness? Was it not sin that had opened his eyes?

With respect to the meaning of the passage ; "And the eyes of them both were opened," we will add that we think we are sustained in it by similar passages in other parts of the Bible, where there can be no doubt that reference is had to the mind and conscience ; passages too, which have an evident allusion to the one under consideration. In Deut. xvi. 19, we read that "a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise." It perverteth his mind, just as the promises of the serpent perverted and blinded the mind of Eve. Again in 2 Cor. iv. 4, "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds." This passage read in connection with the following affords much light ; Acts xxvi. 17, 18. "Delivering thee from the people and from the Gentiles, unto whom I now send thee to open their eyes." Certainly the mind and conscience are here referred to. There are several other allusions which we might adduce, such as the "eyes of the understanding being enlightened," but they may be thought too slight. The slightest allusions, however, are often the most satisfactory. For instance, the allusion to the concernment of the serpent in the Fall, contained in the phrase, "crooked ways," made use of by the Psalmist, is as slight as any one can

wish for ; yet we doubt whether any one can give us any other source for the idea of sin, with which David invests the word "crooked." Neither is there any other source for the idea with which we invest the passage just quoted, than that which we find among the circumstances of the Fall. The original source must be there.

But we need not have taken the trouble to trace these allusions, since there is sufficient to substantiate our position in the context of the passage under consideration. The language made use of by the serpent in the fifth verse deserves attention : "For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil." Evidently, reference is here had to an enlightenment of the mind ; and, when we consider that the opening of the eyes is first spoken of in this passage, it is certainly to be expected that we should attach the same meaning to the same phrase, which is used in the very next verse but one following, and plainly in allusion to what the serpent had said. We do not intend to say that Adam and Eve found the opening of their eyes to be the same in every respect that the serpent had promised ; all we contend for is, that in the one case, as well as in the other, the phrase is used tropically of the mind.

There is still another view which we might take of this subject. Adam and Eve were convicted of their sin. Their eyes were opened, and they saw that they were sinners in the sight of God ; but we have reason to believe that they were finally saved. Verse 21st would seem to intimate this : "Unto Adam also, and to his wife, did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them," an emblem of the righteousness of Christ with which we believe they will stand clothed before the throne of God.

ARTICLE VI.

TRUTHFULNESS IN LITERATURE, THE BASIS OF A
PERMANENT POPULARITY.

PRESENT popularity is no sure test of literary merit. We doubt if on the whole those works that are to do most for the thought of the world can be popular. The new or juster views of life and nature and their relations, by the very fact that they are new or juster, must find a limited audience. The works in theology and philosophy that are now most influential on the thought and life of the church, most potent in our civilization and culture generally, were not ordered by thousands in advance of the day of publication. The best writers must wait for their reward, and receive it at last in the consciousness of real service for their fellow-men, rather than as princely fortunes.

Yet in works of a more popular cast, commanding a large audience, we shall find that it is truth that prevails; it is because it is believed that truth is really expressed that a new work wins an audience and holds it when won.

Lord Macaulay ascribes to Mackintosh and Fox as an eminent qualification for writing history, the fact that "they had spoken history, acted history, lived history." In this respect they had advantages over most English historians. This was no new experience. The best history in Greek literature, that of Thucydides, was composed in the leisure which exile offered to a man of large experience in public life. Tacitus, the most truthful and philosophical of Latin historians, was for a time prætor and afterwards consul. Gibbon acknowledged that he owed a part of his success to his service in the militia and in the House of Commons. Irving could have written his "Conquest of Granada" nowhere but amid the scenes he portrayed; nor his "Columbus" without the familiarity with Spanish life and character that were to be acquired only by an actual residence for some time in Spain.

The first essential in all literature, whether history, poetry, or fiction, is truth. He who presents the most truth is sure of a

hearing, however many times the same story may have been told, or the same scene described. There is really an advantage in coming last for the truly great writer. He will not have the attraction of novelty to be sure, but that is one of the least merits, and one that vanishes with the using; but he will have the advantage of a better command of his materials. The great orators in Congress, who remain in their seats until it would seem that every body had spoken, and the subject under discussion was worn threadbare, command the largest audience when they rise, and leave their speeches to after times. Macaulay did not forbear to go over the same ground that Fox, Mackintosh and others had trod, nor was it any hindrance to Irving that Marshall and Sparks and many of inferior note, had written the life of Washington. The greatness of that wonderful character still waited the master's hand to set it forth in all its grandeur. It required distance to show its relation to its surroundings and to the cause of human freedom in the large field of history. Something of imagination as well as accurate knowledge of detail is required, to set forth any historic character in its just and even proportions. It was no idle speech of an English statesman, that he had acquired his best knowledge of early English history from the historic dramas of Shakspeare.

Rufus Choate once delivered a lecture on "The importance of illustrating New England history by a series of romances like the *Waverly Novels*." He wished to see the writer

"Begin with the landing of the Pilgrims, and pass down to the war of Independence, from one epoch and one generation to another, like Old Mortality among the graves of the unforgotten faithful, wiping the dust from the urns of our fathers, gathering up whatever of illustrious achievement, of heroic suffering, of unwavering faith, their history commemorates, and weaving it all into an immortal and noble national literature, pouring over the whole time, its incidents, its actors, its customs, its opinions, its moods of feeling, the brilliant illustration, the unfading glories, which the fictions of genius alone can give to the realities of life."

Scotland is a very different country from what it was before the days of Sir Walter Scott and of "Christopher North." She is different to herself, as much so perhaps as to the rest of the world. The truth was there, waiting to be revealed to the

eyes of men ; and once revealed, to be henceforth a glorious possession for the world.

We have no need of the sensational style of our modern fiction, with its glare and meteoric splendors. Give us truth, set off by the imagination so as to appear in its own proper brilliancy, and we will welcome every honest worker in this field. The straw-blaze is soon out, the popularity of our sensational writers, however many editions of their works may be crowded off upon the public, will know of no resurrection like the productions of the "wizard of the north."

We would not condemn new ventures in the literary world. We do not believe that all the good styles of writing, or all the good works in old and standard styles have been produced. It was a narrow criticism that said of the *Excursion*, "this will never do." The truth will do, come when and where and by whom it may. Let a work be true in its thought and sentiment to the experience of human hearts, let it tend to elevate our better nature, giving us juster conceptions of life, and nerving our arms to good loyal work for God and humanity, and it will live, a work for the ages.

ARTICLE VII.

THE CHAOS OF BELIEFS.

Is the Apollo or the Hebe inside the block of marble, before the sculptor's chisel has chipped off its first rough angle? Yes, says the idealist, its softly rounded limbs and speaking features (if you will only think so) are all there, awaiting merely the artist's genius to give them deliverance and life. No, replies the plain matter of fact observer, that is no piece of statuary ; it is nothing but a lump of unhewn rock.

Two statements will put us into the heart of our proposed discussion. The first is, that every thing in the universe has its distinct or constituting principles. This is simply saying that every thing is itself ; has an individual or class identity,

and is not a mere name. Wood, water, fire, flesh, bone, metal, gases are substances of uniform composition, according to their kind, the world over. Light is not darkness. Sweet is not bitter. Cold is not heat. These are themselves really, not nominally. Certain qualities belong to them, inhere in them, define them and their locality in the kingdoms of nature. What cannot be classified thus is nothing. Science does not know it; art can not use it. Equally is this true of moral facts. They are as sharply discriminated, as absolutely identified. Evil is not good. Wrong is not right. Vice is not virtue. These are fixed essences, determined from within; no more to be mistaken for each other than a block of ice is to be for a block of marble.

So of spiritual beings. God is himself, personally, purely; the infinitely holy and incommunicable One; not Jupiter, nor Brahma, nor Thor, nor the Pantheist's idea of a universal deified humanity; nor the Deist's, of the forces of the world in actual progression; nor the Liberalist's generally, of a careless, indifferent, easy-handed father and ruler of men. Christ is not Satan, and Satan is not a myth. Man is not an angel nor a fiend nor a passive, involuntary, irresponsible machine. He is not a brute; is not under the government of simply material laws, nor instinctive impulses. He is a reflecting, choosing, sinning, repenting, accountable, immortal agent. Greenough's Washington is not a man, though the majestic shape of one. An idiot is not a man, though a living piece of flesh and blood. He lacks the informing understanding, the electing will. Thus too of human organizations, each has its characteristic principles. These have their different ends and uses, rules and covenants. By these they are distinguished. Things are what they are, in spite of appearances. Shakespeare long ago said;

"Good alone

Is good; without a name vileness is so:

The property by what it is should go,

Not by the title."

Our second position is, that this inner nature or principle of things governs their working and results. Bread and wholesome fruits nourish. Poisons sicken and destroy. Calm water and frozen look much alike; but one will not sustain the tread of a child, the other is a bridge solid enough for the tran-

sit of an army. Regular habits of sobriety and industry tend directly to vigorous health, and aid very greatly to sound opinions of social life. Dissipation breaks down prematurely the physical and spiritual stamina. Like produces like. Wood and coal are combustible, and they will warm you in winter: stones will not generate heat in themselves, nor in your chilled body. The laws of matter are unyielding. To ascend an eminence requires a different movement from descending a valley. To lift a burden demands some other action than merely to look at it. The laws of morals are as stable. According as a man soweth that shall he also reap. We know the road to the penitentiary and the scaffold; it does not lead along the ways of virtue and piety. We know the common causes of unthrift and poverty. One is indolence. The sluggard will not plough by reason of the cold; he shall therefore beg in harvest and have nothing. Another is extravagance. For what wise man among you who buildeth a house sitteth not down first and counteth the cost, whether he be able to finish it? Men do not gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles. Covetousness may make fortunes, but not friends. A lottery, a throw of dice, the forging another's name, may put you in a palace, but can not buy you contentment within its princely halls. Jealous rivalries may win office, but not the respect of the honorable. Lying may be more lucrative for a season than truth, but it is not therefore entitled to truth's rewards, nor can it gain them amidst all its other gains.

Theories of morals have their inner spirit, and this is their shaping force. The Epicurean taught that pleasure, sensual and artistic, pleasure sipped from any flower that opens in any garden of delight, by any roadside of indulgence, that pleasure to the fill is the great good, the first duty of man. That doctrine would make a disciple quite unlike to the Cynic, who put this same chief good and duty in a coarse and cruel mortification of every natural desire. The one would form a voluptuary, the other a squalid but proud mendicant. David Hume and Jeremy Bentham found virtue in utility, and erected the useful as the standard of the right and good. Schiller and the sentimental school generally place beauty in the same relation to truth and goodness, and organize a moral system around this as

a centre. Not the "beauty," however, of Jonathan Edwards, which is the purest, sublimest holiness, the benevolence of God himself; nor the "usefulness" which takes in the widest and last results of God's whole plan of jurisdiction, are the idols (*idola*) of these philosophies, but a finite and palpable beauty and utility, measured by earthly standards, graded to human models, judged by mortal sense. These ethics develop externally after their internal law. Christian ethics do the same. These unseen divergences of opinion and belief give character its real, if not professed and apparent conformation. And what is of most importance, these moral judgments and sentiments shape our religions most powerfully to the true or the false, the safe or the ruinous. It will concern us particularly to illustrate this connection before we are done. These, then, are our two statements — that every thing in the universe has its constituting principles; and that these control its working or results, under the ordination of God. We are now ready to notice, and this is our chief purpose, how these positions are ignored in a wide-spread confusion of ideas and beliefs in morals and religion.

This is done by the substitution and advocacy of positive wrong and error for right and truth. Human perverseness has even "this extent" in some of its more advanced victims. With a distinct knowledge of the downright viciousness of their opinions and practices, perhaps, too, with a clear protest of conscience against them, they deliberately live to persuade others to believe and to trust what they place no confidence in at all, what their own moral sense condemns. On this ground we find very much of the ranker infidelity of the times, going forth on its unblest mission to erase the already faint traces of God's being and claims from thoughtless hearts; to publish the reign of selfish, sensual, lawless passion and appetite; to proclaim the suppression of supernatural authority; to abolish the institutions of Christianity, the Bible, the Sabbath, the church, the kingdom of heaven itself as based on a divinely revealed faith. This godless crusade is often and most naturally in alliance with a corrupt and polluting example. It has its entrenchments in haunts of profligacy; it is in league with intemperate, licentious courses. It does unblushingly the devil's work of tempting

the unwary to sin. It is a seducing spirit rejoicing in the fall of honesty, in the blight of purity, in the stain of honor, in the wreck of virtuous happiness. It is a disorganizer, a destroyer. Its inspiration is infernal. Its sympathies are satanic. Its task is ruin. It says to evil; "thou art good," and knows itself to be a liar in the act. It calls its midnight noonday though the darkness be relieved by neither moon nor star. Against all testimony, and experience, and consciousness, it violently and persistently confounds the plainest distinctions in morals, the most obvious teachings of natural religion. It scoffs at all the better feelings of the soul, its own among the rest. It flings a taunt at the pleadings of humanity for spiritual hope and salvation. It hurls a curse at God, and then laughs at itself for fighting what it said was but a shadow.

But this, though an actual, is not the more frequent mode of unhinging truth, of confusing moral perceptions and beliefs. It is much more consonant with the average state of unregenerate mind to settle contentedly and complacently into partial views and conclusions in morals and religion. There is not a disposition, probably, to go to those other lengths of defiant atheism. There is wanting the reckless or the malignant temper which these demand. A prudential consideration has weight, that it is not expedient so to outrage the sentiments of very many respectable people; nor to run the hazard of so entirely putting one's self in antagonism to what may possibly prove to be God's character and government. Withal a radical indifference to the whole subject of spiritual truth and obligation goes far to repress the wilder excesses of antichristian fanaticism, and to multiply the hosts of those who would perhaps rather choose to be called neither one thing nor another religiously. Of course, there is a forgetfulness here that no such thing is in existence as such a claim supposes. We fall back on our statements, that all things are marked, defined, controlled by certain principles or qualities. Nothings in particular are nonsense. Holiness is not depravity. There is something in every thing which makes it that thing specifically. He would be absurdly simple who should ignore the classifications of natural history and philosophy. How preposterous, how fatal in practice, were there found a fool demented enough to try it thus, the theory which should say that all the differences of visible, tangi-

ble objects are in their names. But too many of our speculators in spiritual science have halted in just this nebulous region of puerile if not criminal confusion, where evil is good and good evil about as men choose so to regard them ; where what a man believes is the least important question which can be put concerning him ; where the chief discovery of the explorers is, that nothing can be or need be fixed with any definiteness or assurance as to the connections of man with God, time with eternity, conduct with future recompense. Talk of the mysteries of the Christian revelation ! Here is a mystification which defies all competition. We can scarcely subject it to any analysis. It has hardly substance sufficient in it to be handled. " Shall I strike at it with my partisan ? " " Do if it will not stand. " " 'Tis here ! " " 'Tis here ! " " 'Tis gone ! "

We concede that genuine goodness is sure of its reward ; that truth is always a safe guide. But what is truth ; and what is goodness ? Something, we again affirm, fixed, positive, ascertainable as is the composition of a tree or a flower. They follow strictly in this the analogies of the entire creation of God. But, fixed and ascertainable, with relation to what index or test of decision ? Here comes in the bearing of our moral theories and spiritual sympathies upon our religious faith. The Epicurean had his religion. Its creed was ; " I believe in indiscriminate enjoyment ; I worship Pleasure. " With this ideal of life running through his judgments of what is good, excellent, desirable, he could not rise beyond this grade of doctrine. His god must be of the family of a Bacchus or a Venus. So the radically defective ethics of the old pagans, as of the modern, shut them off from Jehovah's love, in thralldom to a motley multitude of debasing idols.

" Their gods ! what were their gods ?
 There's Mars, all bloody-haired ; and Hercules,
 Whose soul was in his sinews ; Pluto, blacker
 Than his own hell ; Vulcan, who shook his horns
 At every limp he took ! Great Bacchus rode
 Upon a barrel ; and in a cockleshell
 Neptune kept state. Then Mercury was a thief ;
 Juno a shrew ; Pallas—a prude at best ;
 And Venus walked the clouds in search of lovers !
 Only great Jove, the lord and thunderer
 Sate in the circle of his starry power,
 And frowned ' I will ' to all."

What chance was here for God and his commandments, for Christ and his precepts? These are facts and principles ever working in one direction; they are moving in exactly the contrary. When may they come together, and cement an alliance of the holy and unholy? If, again, virtue be whatever is useful, and this to be determined by the current maxims of thrift and good fortune, the religion of such a morality can be only an idolatry of self, a deification of worldly success. Its temple is the court of Mammon. At no point can it make a junction with the benevolent, the lofty and pure integrity of God. It can never understand the gain of that godliness which denies itself to follow Christ; which takes joyfully the spoiling of its goods for the gospel's sake; which becomes poor that it may be rich; which humbles itself that it may be exalted. Here are antagonistic qualities that will no more coalesce than oil will mingle with water. What is good to one is not good to both. They have no common basis of union. Is beauty goodness? Is truth the harmony of natural objects, the symmetry of forms, the due blending and shading of colors? Is holiness the fine appreciation, the fervid admiration of lovely things in nature and art; of pleasant thoughts, and elevated pursuits, and generous sentiments? Is the æsthetic sense the moral sense? And is its verdict the highest sentence of the right and the wrong? Is the world of matter and of man, under this expositor, the first and the last revelation of doctrine and duty to the human spirit?

So not a few contend, and frame a religion to its prescription. It gives, for this, a thin but elegantly ornamental speculation about the meaning and the method of this life and the next. Its god is a fairy-like being delighting mostly in shadowy woods, and sequestered mountains, and glens and paths of romantic loveliness; in fretted roofs, and columned aisles, and solemn chants of cathedral sanctuaries; caring far more for a tastefully embellished worship than for obedience to a righteous law; ever ready to accept the pretty sentimentalities of devotion as a sufficient equivalent for a service of sincere holiness. With an amiable charity it will see little in man but the brighter side of his better feelings, impulses, acts. Despite his sordid selfishness, and brutish grovelings, and horrid crimes, man is to

its eye a sort of glorified existence, an almost god in disguise, rich in latent virtues which only wait an opportunity to reveal themselves. Virtue is anything which wears a chivalrous, dashing front, a soft and delicate and melting mood, no matter with what interludes of stormier and guiltier passion. It precisely reverses the real condition of man, making goodness the natural groundwork of his character, and depravity its accidental and surface appendage. Heroes are plenty on its calendar; and heroes are all saints, whether Paul or Luther or Robert Burns, or any one who has displayed genius and magnanimity however misled by sin. It has no sight for aught which might inspire alarm concerning man's future destiny. What a beautiful going to sleep is death to the weary of life; how balmy its dew to the fevered brow; how refreshing its deepening twilight to the aching eye; how soft the grave-rest to the worn out body; how inviting the immortal years to the buoyant, jubilant spirit which has only to live on as it has lived here, only with all the pleasures wonderfully enlarged, and the ills and pains reduced to a most desirable unimportance. To die is indeed to meet God; but such a winning, wooing, smiling God; and such a paradise of entrancing sights and sounds to captivate, and enrapture, and educate the taste; who need fear to die, to cross over Jordan to a Canaan so indiscriminately inviting? And what a bigoted theology must that be, which still will talk of

“—— the dread of something after death;”

which still will clothe the transit to eternity and the judgment seat of Christ with terror to the worldling and the wicked; which still will reiterate and reëcho the solemn words; “It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God”!

Sound morals and true piety are in no way opposed to the pursuit of pleasure, the just appreciation of the useful or the beautiful. They give the utmost scope for these, but they insist on judging these and all things by the standard of God's pure holiness, his revealed sentiments, character, acts. No earth-born scheme of morality is religion. Religion is morality regenerated; natural virtue infused with divine grace; the amiabilities, and integrities, and gracefulnesses of human hearts, penetrated, inspired, refined, controlled by the love of God made manifest in Christ, regained through Christ. Christianity is

man restored to God in peace and purity, and everlasting union through God's atoning Son. Its hymn of praise forever is this ; " Giving thanks unto the Father, who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light ; who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son. In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Here are definite, constituting principles of a religious faith, solid, shapely as the foundations, the beams and pillars of a palace. By a personal introduction into this faith, an experimental knowledge of its power, we are in reconciliation with supreme holiness ; we are on the substantial basis of a genuine, practical morality ; we are at the true point of a perception of spiritual beauty ; we are in harmony with a right and useful theory of life ; we are fitted for a desirable death and a blissful eternity. These are the true sayings of God. They give us the religion of morality and the morality of religion. They are fixed quantities in the statement and solution of this grand problem of life and immortality. To reject them, is to call right wrong. To form a system of spiritual science without them, or with them nominally but so modified by opposing elements and alterative constructions as to destroy their proper force, is to put error for truth. A morality, a religion without these central powers is as much a falsehood as would be a steam-engine without a steam-generator ; as would be a banking-house without a dollar in its vaults. Is a stone bread ? Is a scorpion an egg ? Yes ; if spiritual facts and obligations and destinies are whatever men's fancies choose to have them, gossamer threads spun like spiders' webs from their own resources, instead of the unchangeable verities of God's holy word.

Things have a nature ; and the nature of things controls their consequences. To call evil good does not make it good nor safe. To call darkness light does not make it light. To call bitter sweet does not make it sweet. To fashion a false god does not dethrone the true God. To discard gospel faith and salvation does not explode them as delusions. To look on dying as the pleasant gateway to certain rest and happiness does not make it this to an unregenerate sinner. Consequences are as, because they are in, their antecedents. Error ruins, truth

saves. Darkness misleads, light guides. Holiness blesses, sin curses. This is the separation of things radical and universal, each to his own place, which runs through the moral world now; which will run on forever; shaping men's destinies according to their characters, as weighed and measured by God's impartial tests.

ARTICLE VIII.

SHORT SERMONS.

"How precious also are thy thoughts unto me, O God! How great is the sum of them!"—*Ps. cxxxix. 17.*

GOD is a thinking being. The manifestation of wisdom that we everywhere see in his works must be the result of intelligence. We thus have the clearest proof of his personality. Strange it is that there are men who look to no higher source than an unintelligent law-power in nature, for the varied productions of wisdom and omnipotence which are massed in order and rich profusion everywhere around us. Atheism never has been able to solve the problem of the universe, nor pantheism to tell us how intelligence has been evolved from unintelligent or dead matter.

If God's thoughts were precious to the Psalmist, there must in some way have been a disclosure of them to his mind by God. Two questions, therefore, are suggested by the text.

1. How are the thoughts of God disclosed to men?

(a) God's thoughts find expression in executive volitions, and are thus disclosed in his works. The plan of all God's works had been formed in his mind before they were brought forth by the fiat of omnipotence. We read the thoughts of God in every plant, bud, flower, insect and fossil of the earth, in the planets, stars and remotest nebulae of the stellar universe, and in all the laws of nature.

Every new discovery in natural science discloses to us a thought of God which had ever before been hid in the mysteries of eternity. The revelation of his thoughts is thus continually going on, and flashing into our minds. Kepler thus apprehended the subject when on the discovery of one of the laws of planetary motion he exclaimed, "I think thy thoughts after thee, O God!"

(b) God's thoughts are made known to us in the Scriptures.

The Bible is full of the thoughts of God. The thoughts there disclosed are a direct, supernatural revelation to man. By them we know God, his character, what he requires of us, and our moral relations to him. They are vastly more important to us than the revelations of nature.

2. The thoughts of God are precious, because they are pure thoughts, holy thoughts, righteous thoughts, and thoughts of love. The plan of salvation was devised by God. By it he can maintain his justice and yet show mercy to the guilty and undeserving, and save the sinner from eternal death. His thoughts are also without number. "How great is the sum of them."

To all holy beings and good men, the thoughts of God are precious. If not precious to any one this is a sure indication that that heart is corrupt, and needs regenerating. It must be renewed before it can love God and delight in the thoughts which he discloses to men.

"And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering: But unto Cain and his offering, he had not respect."—*Gen. iv. 4, 5.*

HERE are two brothers in the first human family engaged in religious service, and God accepts one and rejects the other. As near to the beginning of man and his rites of worship, and as marked by the immediate and singular discrimination of God, the scene is worthy of deep study.

1. So early there were bloody sacrifices. Then God must have instituted them.

2. Abel's was offered in "faith." *Heb. xi. 4.* This implies a divine promise and human expectation based on it. Because so offered "the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering."

3. Cain's offering was unbloody, "the fruit of the ground," and without faith, and not what God had appointed. These are the only points where it varied from his brother's, and failing in these the Lord "had not respect" to it or to him offering it.

How can we explain all this? We recall the promise of a Saviour to the parents of these brothers. This promise we must suppose was so far unfolded to the parents that they could understand and use it. It is also reasonable to suppose that they explained and taught it to their children. Indeed Abel's "faith" implies this. The import of this promise was Christ, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. From it sprang, under divine instruction, the bloody and typical sacrificial system of the later generations,

pointing to Christ, and ceasing only when he came and was offered for the sins of the world. When, therefore, Abel made his bloody sacrifice in faith, he owned his guilt, his need of the atonement, and his acceptance of the one promised. So God accepted him. Cain on the contrary exercised no faith, made no admission of guilt, confessed no need of a Saviour. He was glad for a good harvest and made the offering of thanksgiving only. His offering had no element of blood, and no recognition of sin, atonement and forgiveness. Proud in self-righteousness, he stood up before his God on the ground of merit, and intelligently, deliberately rejected Christ and the vicarious atonement.

So it came to pass that God so signally discriminated between the two religious acts of the two brothers, and gave to Cain his earnest displeasure.

The great lesson of this remarkable scene, just outside the gates of Eden, is that sinners can offer no acceptable worship while they intentionally reject the great atoning sacrifice. A deliberate denial of the atonement must insure the displeasure of God. To worship acceptably we must feel and confess our demerit and stand "by faith" on the merit of the "Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

ARTICLE IX.

LITERARY NOTICES.

- 1.—*Autobiography, Correspondence, etc., of Lyman Beecher, D. D.* Edited by CHARLES BEECHER, with Illustrations. In two volumes. Vol. I. New York: Harpers. 1864.

SOME works go far to disarm criticism by their clearly intended, if not directly professed discarding of all accepted models, in the department of literature which they traverse. The design to introduce a new style or school of letters naturally inclines one to withhold comment upon the effort, until the experiment obtains a sufficient growth to be satisfactorily estimated.

Mr. Beecher has adventured something of this kind in the life of his honored father. It is a novelty in personal history, and can hardly be judged of definitely in this first volume of the attempt. The plan adopted of a conversational and catechetical narration, with

such unusually full details of collateral persons and events, in epistolary and other methods of description, secures much variety, and imparts no little zest, to the story, if at the expense of unity of impression and individuality of effect. In ordinary cases we should be quite certain of a mistake in this treatment. If it shall prove a success here, it will be against the intrinsic disadvantages of the method, and, as we must think, because simply of the remarkable tendencies which the Beecher family have within themselves of daringly setting at naught all the well considered and consolidated laws of procedure in whatever path they may choose to travel.

We leave the casket for its gem. This is the noble old hero here begun to be outlined. We are content to look long and lovingly at the central figure of the rather crowded canvas, for he was a man to love and to follow with strong and passionate affection. We invariably invest him with the panoply and bearing of one of the foremost chiefs of the church *military*, as a good old saint always would call it. Dr. Beecher was a thorough soldier for Christ to his most central life; and the trophies which he hung up in the halls of victory were numerous as the shields of David's mighty men.

From his beginnings of active life it was manifest that he would tread no humdrum, routine course. But he did not burst on the world like a meteor. His ministry on Long Island did not greatly distinguish him as the coming man of his day. His Litchfield ministry gave him a better position and a wider influence, which he at once began to use in a most stirring manner for the common weal. We have here the details of his embarking in the Temperance reform, and other salutary enterprises for society and the church. He became famous and formidable as an ecclesiastical advocate—a match for the astutest lawyers in contested clerical and parish causes. His revivalist labors stand prominently forth, and show him to be an expert master of the popular mind, as well as a man mighty in the word and grace of God. It is doubtful if ever the American pulpit has had a stronger preacher in the popular sense. He had a way of trenchant reasoning which played and flashed like a short sword; a power of irony, a homely wit and repartee, which was overwhelming; a hearty earnestness, his own “logic set afire,” which carried everything by storm, with the masses of men. There was nothing tricky, fantastical, artificial, about him. Every one saw the manliness of his nature, the ingenuousness of his religion.

Dr. Beecher's literary character wears a very respectable aspect in these reminiscences. He had a hand in the old *Christian Spectator*; was in fact about the soul and body of that incipient organ of distinctive New Havenism in theology. His vigorous endeavors to

make it go alone, when as yet it was an infant of not many days, are amusing and instructive. He held himself ready to furnish articles at very short notice, on almost any topic, when the editorial pile became exhausted. Undoubtedly he was, in sentiment, an ally of the Taylor-school of divinity; but he used to say, that being the older man of the two, he did not see why he should be called a Taylorite. We are led to inquire whether some admissions in this volume do not furnish a solution of a problem which has puzzled many minds? In correcting the evils of a too desponding religious experience may not this good and great man have swung over a little beyond the centre towards the other extreme, and by his great influence, helped to bring in the evils of a too superficial conviction of sin, from which we are suffering so severely? Not forgetting that his own thorough conversion and earnest piety led him to insist on a deep and painful sense of the sinner's lost condition, yet did not the turning away so boldly, even at a small angle from the instructions and practices of the great Master, encourage a wider departure in the next generation? Was here not a repetition of what the younger Edwards did in his modifications of his father's theology? Some small seeds produce large fruits. The variation of the telescope an hair's breadth may cause the eye of the astronomer to miss the fixed stars. In making less of personal examination, and in his wonderful power of imparting hope to the desponding, may he not have let inquirers, even his own children, off too easily, is a question which the following passage on pages 46 and 47, suggests perhaps as strongly as any in the book.

"I can now see that if I had had the instruction I give to enquirers, I should have come out bright in a few days. Mine was what I should now call a hopeful, promising case. Old Dr. Hopkins had just such an awakening, and was tormented a great while. The fact is the law and doctrines, without any explanation, is a cruel way to get souls into the kingdom. It entails great suffering, especially on thinking minds. . . . One reason I was so long in the dark was, I was *under law*, was stumbling in the doctrines, and had no views of Christ. They gave me other books to read besides the Bible—a thing I have done practising long since. For cases like mine, Brainerd's Life is a most undesirable thing. It gave me a tinge for years. So Edwards on the affections—a most overwhelming thing, and to common minds the most entangling. The impressions left by such books were not spiritual, but a state of permanent hypochondria—the horrors of a mind without guidance, motive, or ability to do anything. They are a bad generation of books, on the whole. Divine sovereignty does the whole in spite of them. I was converted in spite of such books. I wish I could give you my clinical theology. I have used my evangelical philosophy all my lifetime, and relieved people without number out of the sloughs of high Calvinism."

The intimations here that, under the older New England teachings, the law and doctrines were held up without any explanations, that no views of Christ were given in connection with them, and that other books were urged before the Bible, shows either an ignorance of those teachings, or an antagonism to them which we did not expect. Were not the large, deep and painful views of sin which such men as Hopkins and Beecher experienced, powerful means of usefulness in their preaching? What is a little more pain and a little longer distress compared with an apostolic earnestness to save the lost and a greater security against a false hope? Verily this "clinical" talk of having "relieved people without number" by means of a newly discovered "philosophy," savors a little of the patent panaceas by which modern inventors promise to cheat death out of all his victims.

Dr. Beecher's mind was not strictly theological. His lectures, out of that chair, were rather stimulative to independent research, than systematic and satisfactory. He had a great power of stirring others' minds. This was the work and value of his life. The next volume will doubtless exhibit this more fully, as the present leaves him only at the threshold of his principal achievements.

- 2.—*Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker, Minister of the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society, Boston.* By JOHN WEISS. In two volumes, 8vo. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1864.

MR. PARKER's life is valuable mainly as a study in the progress of error. It has its incidental literary and æsthetic attractions, the side play of scholarly tastes and habits, a fresh and vigorous love of nature, spicy anecdote, sharp collisions of wit, stern antagonisms personal and professional, much observation of men and things at home and abroad; these lend the volume before us a general power to interest the reader. But beyond all this, the work here given the public so minutely and elaborately, is permanently to be valued as a very unique help to the investigation of the triumph and confirmed dominion of error over a man of large intellectual endowments and great force of character.

The error was this — taking consciousness for a guide in philosophy, and conscience for a guide in religion, as ultimate and absolute authorities. This is a very simple system, but it is simply false. It makes a man *totus in illo*; but the total is supremest folly. Yet Mr. Parker never got outside this individualism. Conscience was his moral inspiration; he wanted no other Bible; consciousness was

his oracle in solving the enigmas of nature and the supernatural; its intuitions were his text-book of appeal and most dogmatic adjudication, "where angels fear to tread."

These volumes are seasoned from beginning to end with just the self-asserting, pugnacious, proud, recalcitrating spirit which must inevitably flow from such a source. It is the life of a human demigod which is written here. The hero feels his vocation to this regnancy; it breathes out from his person in lecture desk, in his study, in letters and conversations; he goes through life leaning on himself, and he goes out of life in the same isolated individualism in which he has wrought his earthly task. We get no relief from this dreary impression through the prayers which are here recited; to us they lack the really childlike heart of a true suppliant unto God. The biographer intensifies this feeling which oppresses us, by his ill-placed resurrection of the defiant flippancy of his dead master, in his own imitation of that spirit. It is an all-pervasive spirit. It followed Mr. Parker wherever he went, though he was forever preaching up a charity which he did not exercise. He used to say, in the Music Hall, severer things concerning his opponents than they ever said, in the pulpit, against him. This were enough for exhibition, without drawing from other sources. But Mr. Weiss has blemished his work with an unpardonable quantity of antichristian bile on his own account. He spurts it at us with a persistent will which manifestly gives him great satisfaction. He obviously belongs to the select number who regard Mr. Parker as himself a fulfilment of his own prediction, that a greater and wiser than Jesus is to be expected in these latter days. Others of the "Fraternity" have directly said this. Mr. W. does not; yet he writes as if he were making reprisals all along upon the virtual crucifiers of another Messiah. Judged by sound critical tests, we regard this biography a failure. It is rather a great partizan pamphlet than a generous, well balanced, naturally toned, artistically truthful history. Yet we do not mean by these strictures to modify the concession made at the beginning, of the value of this memoir as a museum of literary curiosities and anatomical studies.

The reviewers have noticed, with just severity, the tampering with the original plates of these volumes, in the present reprint, by erasing several stinging paragraphs from Mr. Parker's letters, because they attacked two or three gentlemen who are much idolized by a part of the American public. Mr. Weiss should have rigidly excluded from these pages the offensive personalities in which Mr. Parker was wont very freely to indulge, even at the expense of emptying his casters of some of their most piquant condiments. But, if he could not

practice a sufficient self-restraint to forego this sensational stimulation, he should have made fair play all around. The biographer indeed publishes his disclaimer of any knowledge of these erasures from his text. But it was done, nevertheless, leaving the public to wonder at the impropriety of thus attempting to screen Messrs. Horace Greeley, and H. W. Beecher from Mr. Parker's sarcasms, while no shield is thus interposed before such respectable persons as several of the professors at Harvard, and the Unitarian ministers in Boston from whom the progressive apostle of free thinking parted company somewhat severely, in his onward but not upward flight.

Mr. Parker's attitude as an anti-slavery reformer and politician was distinctly understood. We have never questioned his honest love of freedom, his leading agency in stirring the country to zeal for negro emancipation. We just as plainly say that in our judgment his zeal was not always guided by sound knowledge, nor tempered as it should have been by Christian charity. About all the good which we regard him as having done to his generation, we must, for ourselves, look for in this direction. If the sum total be smaller than we could wish to find, we do not consider the fault to lie with us.

Again renewing our acknowledgments to this work for much exhilaration and some profit derived from its pages, we are constrained to say, that so far as it details the record of a professed builder of an ethical and religious structure, it seems to us to be only a great agglomeration of wood, hay and stubble.

3.—*Speeches, Lectures and Letters.* By WENDELL PHILLIPS. Boston: Walker, Wise & Co., 245 Washington St. pp. 562. 1864.

HERE are twenty-four of the speeches, lectures and letters of Mr. Phillips. The speeches are about one-half of those which have been reported during the last ten years. They form an interesting part of the history of the great anti-slavery struggle which has culminated in this most terrific war. There is a wonderful power in them, especially of sportive invective. Ever and anon the red-hot iron gleams and blisters, and while the victims hiss and groan, the multitudes shout and applaud. The subjects of these speeches are the most exciting and they were delivered in the most turbulent assemblies. These are some of the themes which the fascinating and fiery eloquence of this kind, bitter man will bear safely down to many generations of eager readers: The Murder of Lovejoy; Surrender of Sims; The Boston Mob; Harper's Ferry; Lincoln's Election; The Burial of John Brown, &c. The volume is in the best style of Walker & Wise.

4. — *A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians.* With a revised Translation. By CHAS. J. ELLICOTT, B.D. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1864.

THE successive volumes of this Commentary on the Pauline Epistles show a steady perfecting of the method of interpretation adopted by the author. Grounding himself in a thorough analysis of the text, he draws out its meaning by a strict adherence to the laws of language. The lexical criticism is exact and clear. There is enough reference to authorities, but the page is not overloaded with them, and those given are invariably of the best. The variation of the old English versions is a novel and admirable feature. The Greek text is given, and a new translation follows which is very carefully done, adhering more closely to the original than Conybeare and Howson's version, if not so smoothly flowing in the verbal construction. We like the scholarly and Christian confidence which Bishop Ellicott reposes in his own well considered and mature conclusions, a somewhat marked contrast to the vacillation of Dean Alford's judgments in the different editions of his commentaries. The theological views of Dr. Ellicott are much sounder than Alford's. If our biblical students would make themselves masters of the method of interpretation pursued so successfully in these commentaries, and use them as suggestive helps to similar studies of their own, the results could not fail to be richly remunerative.

5. — *Satan's Devices and the Believer's Victory.* By REV. WILLIAM L. PARSONS, A.M., Pastor of the Congregational church, Mattapoisett, Mass. 12mo. pp. 312. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1864.

THIS volume combines the practical and devout character of the sermon with much of the style of the essay. Its spirit is good. It makes much of the personality and present activity of Satan among mankind. The author dwells on Satan's methods of working, his planting and culture of unbelief, obscuring of leading Christian doctrines, sowing of error, dissension and indifference to vital truths and vital godliness, and his corruption of logic, philosophy and theology. In controversy with him and his wiles Christ and Christian truth are shown as coming to the relief of the believer and insuring a final victory.

So far as this outline goes we esteem the work as practical and profitable for godly men. The author makes a good point for our times of floating as to the nature of sin and personality of the devil, by showing that Satan is a person having much to do personally in the public, business, family and private life of men.

But when our author comes to discuss theological questions, and to define terms and harmonize the schools, we lack sympathy with his teachings. He speaks of Christian experience somewhat after the manner of the mystics, and encourages a kind of mystically positive assurance of being in Christ. The idea of an inner and direct spiritual light seems to be advanced, that underlies much religious fanaticism. He fails in a clear distinction between sin and sinfulness, the sin of an act and the sinfulness of the actor, as thus on p. 244: "Suppose a man to be assaulted with impure and lustful thoughts, which, if indulged, would lead to sin." But what are they, though not indulged, and what the state of heart whence they come as from their native place? There is the same obscurity to our minds running through chapter xxv. where knowledge of God is taken to be synonymous with holiness. "We may have his thoughts, his ideas, his views filling and perfectly satisfying the intelligence," and the measure of such knowledge is the measure of one's holiness.

In this is laid a ground for perfection. "We may hope, as to the will, that through this divine knowledge of Christ it will become so devoted to him that it will cease, knowingly, to swerve from its fidelity. It may so far overcome temptation as to remain inflexible," etc. As to the intellect and obtaining a knowledge of the will of God concerning us "doubtless the Holy Ghost will so bring this home to our apprehension, that we can become, and remain, consciously devoted to it, and that we may know our specific acts to be in harmony with it and executive of it." pp. 252—4. On pp. 269—70 there is a confounding of justification and complete sanctification.

On pp. 267 *et seq.*, the author applies his theories and reasonings to harmonize the conflicting views on entire and partial sanctification, instantaneous and gradual sanctification, ability and inability, the sinfulness and non-sinfulness of our nature. He works a concord in these differences by showing according to his theory, that both sides are true. One passage will illustrate the process of reasoning:

"A man who is lost may have ability to go home, but he can not use it till he knows which way to go; his difficulty is not want of ability direct, but of knowledge. Does not the old school doctrine of inability lie exactly here, and is it not true? But when an object, worthy of choice or love, is revealed to the mind's apprehension, then we can easily and naturally bring our ability into play, and choose it. We can take hold upon it and receive it into our hearts. This we are doing every day. Does not the new school doctrine of ability lie here, and is it not true, and beautifully harmonious with the doctrine of apparent inability?"

If this be so, many volumes have been written under a misapprehension of a point, and not a few theological chairs have been duplicates and needless. But excepting some of the doctrinal points and their influence in the work we like its spirit and tendency. Evidently a devout and earnest Christian heart has dictated its pages.

6. — *Church Pastorals: Hymns and Tunes for Public and Social Worship.* Collected and Arranged by NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D.D. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1864.

WE wish that there were but one Hymn Book in the churches of our denomination, and we should be well content if this were that one. It would save pastors from a great inconvenience, and would help to supply a very much needed *esprit de corps*. But this tastefully arranged and published collection must make its way against numerous and more or less popular competitors.

Its special characteristics are a severe adherence to the original forms of hymns, excepting unessential changes for rhythm in some pieces, and the shortening of such as were too long. The number of compositions falls a little short of one thousand. These include our choicest hymns of devotion. Some favorite pieces will not be found, but there are enough for all occasions of public or social worship. Books of devotional poetry for private reading had better be resorted to for compositions which are not suited to musical expression. Such volumes are becoming common and many of them are very rich in the best of sacred poems.

The music of this work has cost long labor and shows the touches of a finely cultivated taste and of much artistic genius in its arrangement. Tunes have been avoided which are devoid of a marked character, and those have been sought which, when learned, have a power to keep themselves in memory and use because they are really in accord with the soul's own wants and aspirations. Every one knows the difference between such pieces of music. One of these living tunes which keeps singing itself forever among the people is worth a thousand humdrum harmonies of which the best description is that there is nothing to them. Dr. Adams has relied mainly on the genuine melodies which are to be found in the ecclesiastical music of different languages, and on the old chorals which never wear out.

The adaptation of hymns to tunes is as perfect in this work as can probably be attained. The tunes have no less distinctness of expression than the hymns, and unusual skill is manifest in the application of these to each other. Verse and harmony are wedded not by contrasts but by likenesses. It is a thoroughly devout book,

suffused with the fervor of a Christian heart as well as embellished with the gracefulness of a pure æsthetic sensibility. If this collection does not command a quick popularity, we think that it will eventually triumph. Any one familiar with our congregations knows that they need a work the music of which shall displace the piles of singing books that are now encumbering our churches whether the singing be by the choir, or be congregational, or a mixture of both. Such a book we have not yet had unless this proves to be the one. If its music shall stand the test of trial, it will be adopted as supplying a real want of our Christian assemblies.

- 7.—*The Natural History of Secession*; or, Despotism and Democracy at Necessary, Eternal and Exterminating War. By THOMAS SHEPARD GOODWIN, A.M. 12mo. pp. 328. New York: John Bradburne. Cincinnati: Rickey & Carroll. Boston: A. Williams & Co. 1864.

WE are constantly surprised at the new forms in which secession and the rebellion are set. Each observer has his own standpoint, usually given or suggested by his own experiences; and from his point of view we have phases unlike those of any other author. Yet are they all needed to make up an entire presentation of this huge rebellion. Mr. Goodwin has well filled his department in the work, and from an interior view of slavery and a wide survey of national and international relations to it, he has given the public a volume comprehensive, condensed, earnest, bold and unique in both plan and style.

With a singular simplicity and power the author speaks right out and dashes on and on through forty-seven chapters to his conclusion. The more we have examined the book the more we have been interested in it.

- 8.—*The National Almanac and Annual Record for the Year 1864*. pp. 641. Philadelphia: Geo. W. Childs.

A HAND-BOOK of the country on its government, offices, officers, finances, elections, navy, armies, education, postal service, commerce, population. Each State and Territory has here its place with tables of its officers, courts, judiciary, banks, common, normal and higher schools, benevolent and humane institutions, asylums and prisons, vital statistics, etc. A striking feature of the volume is a summary under each State of the volunteer enlistments and organizations now making up our immense army. A graphic and condensed chronological record of the military and naval movements of the nation for 1863 is given. The new revenue system is presented,

and the fruits of its first year are tabled. Each vessel in our navy is described and her officers named, as well as her movements. A summary of the agricultural interests, national debts and resources and expenses, sickness and death in the army, the composition of Congress and an abstract of the laws passed in 1863, foreign representatives and agents of the Government, names of all officers in the U. S. army and navy, and an outline of the heads of all foreign governments — these items indicate the rich contents of this annual.

9. — *Annual of Scientific Discovery; or Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art for 1864; Exhibiting the most important Discoveries and Improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Zoology, Botany, Mineralogy, Meteorology, Geography, Antiquities, etc., together with Notes on the progress of Science during the year 1863; a list of recent Scientific Publications, Obituaries of Eminent Scientific Men, etc.* Edited by DAVID A. WELLS, A.M., M.D., author of *Principles of Natural Philosophy, Principles of Chemistry, First Principles of Geology, etc.* 12mo. pp. xiv., and 351. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1864.

THIS is a promising title-page, but the contents well sustain it. The work takes a wide and exceedingly fascinating range from "the Sewers of Paris" to "the origin of the Gipsies." Anything new in Mechanics and the Fine Arts, the Science of War and its material, Natural Philosophy in its many departments, Discoveries in Antiquity, or the mental, animal, mineral or vegetable kingdom, in a word, all the newer or more profound, indicated or suggested by the title-page, is here well arranged, stated and indexed. Evidently the world moves, and this volume gives quite as convincing evidence that during the year 1863 we Americans did something besides the carrying on of a huge war.

10. — *Work and Play; or Literary Varieties.* By HORACE BUSHNELL. 12mo. pp. 464. New York: Charles Scribner. 1864.

THE most of the articles in this volume are already widely and well known to the public, and it was a happy thought given to the author to embody them in a book. They are among the choicest productions of Dr. Bushnell's peculiar pen. He calls them the "literary by-play of a laborious profession," and for that very reason likely to be the gems of his intellectual work-shop. The spontaneity, the self-moving love for the theme, and the leisurely, long-continued labor with which a scholar works off some pet project in lit-

erature, insure the result to stand among his very best productions. This volume shows all the salient points in the author's style of thought and expression. Like all authors he delights to say things in his own way, but unlike most he succeeds in having a way of his own. Terse, brilliant, pointed and fully alive, he often gives us his thoughts in a backward, introverted and surprising way, as if the aim were oddity. Yet in reading him it is in this respect as a rural ride where the surprising crookedness of the road is a continual delight. We find many a sweet flower, and brook and dell in the windings, and are kept in the happy suspense of not knowing where we are going till we get there. Sometimes, it is true, it would be a relief if the Doctor would tell us where we are, or whether we have really reached a destination. This volume is full of thought, and the variety of themes makes it a delightful miscellany.

11. — *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Executive Committee of the Prison Association of New York.* Transmitted to the Legislature, Jan. 29, 1864. pp. 512.

THIS is an exceedingly instructive Report, drawn up with research, care and fidelity. The section on "The Sources of Crime" we have especially read with a deep and painful interest.* It is a stern policy in government to punish crime, while it takes no cognizance of its sources nor tries to dry up the springs of evil. Among the sources, with many startling facts under each, the Report mentions the following: Grog-shops, brothels, theatres, gambling-houses and lotteries, (the French name for the last source of crime is *rafle*,) prisons, when badly managed, official neglect to arrest criminals, bad books, orphanage, insanity, ignorance, want of a trade or profession, poverty, inefficient police, immigration, contact with thoroughfares of travel and trade, density of population, Sabbath-breaking, loss of ministerial and religious instruction, and innate depravity. The Report estimates that two millions of books are sold on our public highways and at the centres of travel, a very large proportion of which are of "the worst character, tending to corrupt the principles, to inflame the passions, to excite impure desire, and to spread a blight over the powers of the soul." "Few prisoners who can read at all fail to enumerate, among the causes which led them into crime, the unhealthy stimulus of this depraved and pernicious literature." pp. 405, 6. What the Report says of insanity as a source of crime we should receive only with grave qualifications.

* This chapter is a reprint from the *Am. Theol. Review*.

ARTICLE X.

THE ROUND TABLE.

YES AND NO. There are no two words in the English language deserving so deep respect and reverence as these two Saxon monosyllables. They are to a man's uprightness and strength of character what the two pillars were to the house that Samson brought down on the Philistines; "the two middle pillars on which the house stood, and on which it was borne up." He who owns not these words belongs himself to somebody. Having no controlling will of his own he must suffer another's to enter into and possess him, and then he will become as the ass to Balaam. Sometimes enough of latent independence will arise to show itself, provoke the spur, and then subside by meekly replying, as that renowned beast of old: "Am I not thine ass upon which thou hast ridden ever since I was thine own unto this day? Was I ever wont to do so unto thee?" The man who lacks the ability to use these two words lacks promptness, daring, persistence. Unable to pronounce them, he is obliged to pronounce the name of a master, and so he becomes merely something, an appendage to somebody. Yes and no constitute the Mason and Dixon's line between freedom and slavery, between the chattel and the man.

In one of his facetious announcements of "Books to be Printed," Swift proposed "A Political Essay on Monosyllables, Proving, That there's more Eloquence in the two Opposites of *Yes* and *No*, than in all *Cicero's* Orations." We devoutly wish the Essay could have been written for the benefit of shilly-shally nothingarians. We deeply commiserate them as seen in close places on moral, theological, ecclesiastical, political and social questions, vainly trying to say something definite and stand somewhere in particular. For the relief of such called suddenly to extemporize an answer or opinion we commend this general formula following. It can be committed to memory, and serve on various occasions, as Cicero made introductions for his orations. 'The question staggers me. The more I think of it the more I can not tell. As near as I can now judge I think I do not know. Much might be said both ways and neither way be right. Upon the whole, I think I would or I would not, just as I thought best or otherwise.'

LITERARY ANNOUNCEMENT. In that remarkable book ycleped "A History of New York, from the Beginning of the World to the End of the Dutch dynasty, by Diedrich Knickerbocker," occurs the fol-

lowing passage which recent events seem about to invest with the dignity of prophecy. We quote the learned and far seeing author :

"It is astonishing how intimate historians do daily become with the patriarchs and other great men of antiquity. As intimacy improves with time, and as the learned are particularly inquisitive and familiar in their acquaintance with the ancients, I should not be surprised if some future writers should gravely give us a picture of men and manners as they existed before the flood, far more copious and accurate than the Bible ; and that, in the course of another century, the log-book of the good Noah should be as current among historians as the voyages of Captain Cook, or the renowned history of Robinson Crusoe."

We have never been so struck with the probability of the verification of this remark as in the critical omniscience of the bishop of Natal's last volume on Moses and Joshua. The bishop's intuition of the making up of these venerable records is equal to a veritable Scotch grandame's second sight. He professes to have set down every word which was taken to compose these books, alike from the older assumed Elohistie and Jehovistic documents, giving to each its origin from the one to the other, just as though he had looked over the penman's shoulder and seen the whole process from alpha to omega. This would be surprising if this were not the nineteenth century. The next thing undeniably must be the Noachian log-book. Of course the bishop can look it up, or else make it to order. Did he not finish his education among the Zulus? When that is done, perhaps he will give us Methusaleh's diary, or Adam's almanac. Either could hardly fail of being as entertaining and authentic as Robinson Crusoe.

"A LIVING DOG IS BETTER THAN A DEAD LION." And yet that depends much on circumstances. Some of the works of dead authors, men of renown, are like the carcass of Samson's lion, full of honey to give strength and fame to some men as they go by, and so furnishing the principal sweetness and power of many modern and popular volumes. In reading the new and then the old, within the range of literature, we have sometimes been inclined to think that he has the best reputation for originality of thought and good style who has gone farthest back among old authors, and has the most to do with dead lions. We will not deny originality to some modern and prolific literary men, while we quote the saying of Curran : "The race of writers and reasoners and thinkers passes away, and gives place to a . . . superficial and overweening generation of laborious and strenuous idlers, of silly scholiasts and wrangling mooters, of prosing garulists." Leaving out of the question works

on the physical sciences, and confining ourselves to metaphysical, religious, moral, social and literary themes, how much are we adding to the worth of our old libraries? Whose religious writings are to rank with Jeremy Taylor's? Walton well says of him: "Had his parts and endowments been parcelled out among his poor clergy that he left behind him, it would, perhaps, have made one of the best dioceses in the world." We have a pretty way of telling incidents, writing fiction and getting up a literary entertainment, yet our English prose is jejune, degenerate and slipshod, compared with that of the Elizabethan age, while as to weight of thought in the larger part of the popular volumes, it requires no shoulders of Atlas to carry them through the drawing-rooms and the club-rooms. We are quite in the habit of publishing and puffing the fair conversation and remarks of those who read antiquated works. So it comes to pass that the modern literary thinkers are the men who most mouse about in alcoves and among old authors.

HINTS TO CANDIDATES. To outsiders and mere observers this calling of pastors must be covered with deep mystery. We offer a few hints to the man who wishes to succeed.

(a) Be good-looking. If one can not, it is his great misfortune, for the congregation think much of this. Absalom made a fine appearance, and so was very popular for a time. (b) Be unmarried. Young theologians make a grave mistake often on this point, if they desire an early settlement. (c) Preach but few sermons as a candidate. The third Sabbath has ruined the prospects of many a man. (d) Put no definite, certainly no controverted theology in the sermon. Nothing spoils the plans of some candidates sooner than to preach their theology right out. Preach no exegetical sermons. (e) Be as young as possible and disown all experience as a pastor. Years and practice in the ministry are against a man who wants a settlement. The church seems to prefer apprentice-work in the ministry. (f) The literary element is the most successful part of a sermon. This should be thoroughly elaborated and garnished. Scripture quotations may be inserted if they do not mar the beauty or break the connection of thought in the sermon. (g) Show some religious tendencies. This is fitting if not expected, and a measure of religion does not on the whole injure the prospects of a candidate.

It should be added that these hints must be used by the candidate with discrimination as to places. Some churches need to be approached under one head and some under another.